MAR 28 1969

JOURNAL
OF
BIBLICAL LITERATURE

EDITED BY

GEORGE DAHL

BENJAMIN W. BACON FRANK C. PORTER

v.47

1928. (no table of contents)

and

VOLUME XLVIII

1929

LIBRARY OF
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
J862
B582 74677

NEW HAVEN, CONN.
PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE
AND EXEGESIS
1929

PRINTED BY OFFIZIN HAAG-DRUGULIN AG., LEIPZIG (GERMANY)
FOR THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

LIBRARY OF
Lebrake Theological Seminary
20
BL
2F

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

VOLUME XLVII 1928

PARTS I AND II

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE BIBLE TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION . . . . . I. F. WOOD 1
THE JEWISH BIAS OF PAUL . . . . . S. J. CASE 20
JESUS' ATTITUDE TO THE LAW OF MOSES . . H. BRANSCOMB 32
PETER'S VISION OF THE RISEN CHRIST . . S. V. McCASLAND 41
THE ASCENSION STORY . . . . . M. S. ENSLIN 60
THE NON-SEPTUAGINT ELEMENT IN THE VOCABULARY OF PAUL . . . . . D. W. RIDDLE 74
"PROTO-LUKE" AND THE "CHICAGO THEORY" OF THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM . . . . . A. M. PERRY 91
THE VOICE FROM THE WHIRLWIND . . . . . M. BURROWS 117
THE REAL RELIGION OF ANCIENT ISRAEL . . E. G. KRAELING 133
PSALM 14 UND 53 . . . . . K. BUDDE 160
THREE ASSYRIOLOGICAL FOOTNOTES TO THE OLD TESTAMENT . . . . . R. H. PFEIFFER 184
BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS
The Strophic Arrangement of the Benedicite . . E. B. CHRISTIE 188
An Identification of tiškaḥ yemīnī, Ps. 137 5 . . . . . I. EITAN 193
Two Notes on the Kalamu Inscription . . J. A. MONTGOMERY 196
Die Fortsetzung von Baudissins Kyrios-Werk . . . . K. BUDDE 198
Summer Meetings 200
BOOKS RECEIVED 201

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS
Drawer 8, Yale Station
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

5.00 A YEAR DOUBLE NUMBERS, $2.50

United Theological Seminary
AR 28 1969

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

PUBLICATION COMMITTEE FOR 1928

GEORGE DAHL, Yale University.
B. W. BACON, Yale University.
FRANK C. PORTER, Yale University.

Communications for the Editors should be addressed to Prof. GEORGE DAHL, 2102 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.

Articles appearing in the Journal are regularly listed in the International Index to Periodicals.

Members two years in arrears in the payment of dues will be dropped from membership in the Society.

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY FOR 1928

President	L. W. BATTEN, General Theological Seminary.
Vice-President . . .	J. E. FRAME, Union Theological Seminary.
Recording Secretary . .	HENRY J. CADBURY, Bryn Mawr College.
Corresponding Secretary	GEORGE DAHL, Yale University.
Treasurer	MILLAR BURROWS, Brown University.
Associates in Council .	H. C. ALLEMAN, Syracuse University. MOSES BAILEY, Wellesley College. E. OLIVE DUTCHER, Wellesley College. H. S. GEHMAN, Philadelphia. SOLOMON ZEITLIN, Dropsie College.
Representative among the Trustees of the American Schools of Oriental Research	WARREN J. MOULTON, Bangor Theological Seminary.

Printed by W. Drugulin, Leipzig (Germany),
for the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE BIBLE TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION[1]

IRVING F. WOOD
SMITH COLLEGE

IN 1649 a translation of the Quran was published in London. Its title page read in part, "The Alcoran of Mahomet, translated out of the Arabique in French . . . newly Englished, for the satisfaction of all that desire to look into the Turkish Vanities." It contained a "needful Caveat or Admonition for those who desire to know what use may be made of, or if there be danger in reading the Alcoran." In this Admonition those of weak or unstable minds are warned away from this dangerous book.[2]

Such was at that time the attitude of the Christian world toward other religions; an attitude unquestioned for many centuries. The only source of religion was the Bible. Outside of Christianity and Judaism lay only "the welter of heathenism," in Calvin's phrase; a mass of unreasonable superstition, unworthy of the attention of any scholar enlightened by the true religion. At best, it was the untaught imaginings of the natural man; at worst, the deceit of the devil. In any case, it was not to be taken seriously as

[1] Presidential Address delivered before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis at a meeting held in Union Theological Seminary, New York City, December 27, 1927.

[2] First American edition, Springfield, 1808. This omits the "Admonition," and has a preface beginning, "This book is a long conference of God, the angels, and Mahomet, which that false prophet very grossly invented."

religion. Religion was found in the Bible, and in the Bible only.

Much water has run under the bridge since then. It is a far cry from that attitude to the condition of thought about religion at the present day. The older attitude seems so antiquated that it is usually called mediaeval. In fact, however, the change has largely come within the last century. It is only fifty-six years since the publication of James Freeman Clarke's *Ten Great Religions,* the first popular expression of the serious attempt to study other religions offered to the American public.

It is not necessary to enumerate at length the reasons for this change. They include the whole range of the modern broadened vision of the world. They grow out of the romance of the discovery that Sanskrit was allied to the European languages, leading to the study of the religious literature embodied in that language; the growing understanding of other races; the gradual approach to the unification of the world; the later application of evolution to the human race and its cultures; and, not the least, the better understanding of the biblical religions themselves. All this led with increasing urgency to the attempt to understand other religions. Understanding bred tolerance. But even a Christian can see that tolerance is a snobbish word, and that sympathy must take its place. The history of religion is the profoundest attempt to understand the inner life, the thoughts and intents of the heart, of all the peoples of the earth, ever made in the field of scholarship.

The result of this has been that the Bible takes its place beside other sacred literatures as only one of the great documents in the religious evolution of mankind. Moreover, since a knowledge of the Biblical religions is often assumed—how mistakenly we all know—to be the common possession of intelligent people, the emphasis of students of the history of religion is often thrown upon those Oriental religions which require much explanation if they are to be understood by Occidentals; or even upon the religious ideas and practices of primitive races.

So far has the pendulum swung in this direction that the student of the Bible sometimes seems to be the acolyte at a minor shrine in the great temple where are placed the altars of the religions of the world. It is time for the pendulum to swing back somewhat. Bible students may well claim the supremacy of the Bible among the literary sources of the History of Religion; not on the old ground that it presents *the* true religion and all the rest are false, but on the ground that it is the literature of greatest importance. It presents much material in better form than any other literature; and it presents some supremely important elements not presented at all elsewhere.

The most important literature for the history of religion is that which meets the following tests:

1. The literature expressing the widest range of religious experience.
2. The literature showing most clearly the growth from lower to higher religious experience.
3. The literature presenting most fully the effects of their religion upon the life of a people.
4. The literature exhibiting most plainly religious standards of permanent value.

In short, the most valuable literature is that from which we can deduce most clearly the laws of the evolution of religion. The formal statement of those laws is yet, for the most part, to be made, because the science of the history of religion is still in its formative stage. It is precisely at this formative stage that the relative value of sources becomes supremely important. I am led to deal with this subject because it seems to me that the history of religion is liable to base its conclusions upon partial, obscure, and sometimes erratic sources, while ignoring a source fuller, clearer, and more widely representative of religious development. The only persons from whom we can expect such a presentation of this source as will redress the balance are the biblical scholars.

1. The first point—that the most valuable literature is that which expresses the widest range of religious experience—

immediately sets the Bible immeasurably above any other literature.

Religion is a protean movement and plays on all the keys of life in one form or another. I am not now raising the question of whether any other people have had as various religious experiences as the Hebrews of the Old Testament and their successors of the New Testament. Be that as it may, no other people have expressed such various experiences in a body of religious literature. Consider the extraordinary kaleidoscope of Hebrew history, all interpreted in terms of religion, and all finding expression in the literature. Add to this the remarkable outburst of new hope and enthusiasm of nascent Christianity in the New Testament, and you have a mass of religious experience before which any other literature pales like the moon at sunrise. Robinson, in his recent *Outline Introduction to the History of Religion,* makes a mild statement when he says, "There is no other religion whose history we trace with more clearness, for we have literature coming from practically all except the very earliest period" (p. 154). Add to this the shifts of religious thought which made the variations of prophet and priest, of national and personal religion, of monolatry and monotheism, of Ḥokhmah and Apocalypse, and there is here a wider range of material than in any other body of religious literature.

For the nearest comparison, as for so many other things in the history of religion, one must turn to the literature of the two great religions of India. For present purposes we may take them together, treating the literatures of Hinduism and Buddhism as in some measure paralleling the biblical literatures of Judaism and Christianity; though the parallelism is by no means perfect. Acknowledging the impossibility of accurately dating the early Hindu literature, we may say that the extent of time covered by the Indian literature is quite as great as that of the biblical literature. There is also variety in kind. There are hymns, laws, ritual directions, the beginnings of philosophy; if we include the Pali Buddhist scriptures, we shall add biography of a sort. There are fables and folktales, the poetry of quietistic feeling and, in the

Dhammapada, a collection of proverbial wisdom and maxims comparable to the Hebrew Ḥokhmah.

Does not such a variety equal that of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures? It certainly contains, as we shall see later, one element which is not a part of the Bible; but even with this, and with the wide extent of time and variety of content, it does not present as wide a range of experience.

The reason is this: the Indian scriptures are detached from history; the biblical scriptures are embedded in history. No one could gain from the Hindu writings the remotest idea of the vicissitudes of national life. The priest and the forest hermit are the two classes of persons concerned; and even where, as in the Laws of Manu and the Buddhist writings, the layman and householder come into consideration, it is only as individuals, and even then somewhat nebulously. We miss the throb of the multifarious problems of life. There is only one problem; how to gain good for the individual. The nation and its life never appear at all. The triumphs and disasters of national life, its prosperity and adversity, the judgments of its rulers as righteous or wicked, the tragedy of holding faith in a god who either cannot or will not save his people, the necessity for new standards of conduct and a new conception of God, the enlarging vision forced by the events of the passing centuries, all these things, so familiar to the reader of the Bible, are not in the Hindu scriptures.

"Religion is what the individual does with his own solitariness," says Professor Whitehead (*Religion in the Making*, pp. 16, 47). For the historian of religion that is only the beginning of it. What a man is in his relation to others, that is the outcome. No religious literature which takes account only of man as a solitary being facing a solitary Supreme, will ever be a prime source for the history of religion. The religious man must be a social man before his religion is complete. The Bible presents a wider range of religious social experience than can be found anywhere else.

2. The Bible presents most clearly the growth from lower to higher religious experience.

Here are two questions: Which presents the widest range between lower and higher stages of religion; and, which exhibits most clearly the growth from one to the other? Most of the scriptures of the world present only a single stage of religious progress. Obviously that is true of the Quran; so it is of the Confucian Classics and the Taoist writings. In the Avesta the Gathas stand at a different stage from the later writings, though which is lower and which higher might be a nice question. The Christian New Testament also represents only one stage. The Hebrew scriptures give us a wide range from a very primitive to a very high stage. The closest comparison which can be made is again with the Hindu literature. The Vedic hymns represent a primitive type of religion. The gods are mostly nature forces, somewhat vaguely personified into anthropomorphic beings. The worship is simple, though rapidly becoming complex. It represents the stage when the head of the state or household is the sacrificer, but already the priesthood is in process of growth.

But even so, the primitive elements in the Bible represent an earlier stage. The Vedic hymns record a ritual stage approximating the beginning of the Hebrew kingdom, not the patriarchal traditions. The hymns are remembered and recited by attendants already well on the way toward priestly claims of authority, even though the sacrificer is still a layman. On the other hand, no priest dictated the words or the actions of the family heads in the patriarchal traditions. Whatever may be the historic origins of those old stories, they antedate a priesthood. They also present a far wider range of life. Students of the Vedas have exercised much skill in reconstructing from these fossil fragments the living structure of early Indian society. The student of early Israel has a much easier task, in spite of all the problems of Hexateuchal sources. Folk-stories are always richer revelations of the varieties of life than are liturgies.

At the other end of the line the Hebrew and the Hindu literature each reach a conclusion beyond which nothing can go. The Hindu thought issues in a pantheistic monism which

marks the end of the road in that direction. Hebrew thought reaches a personal monotheism which is the end of the road in that direction. But the full, clear statement of Hindu pantheism comes only in the sutras and commentaries of the Vedantic philosophy, after the close of the Hindu accepted canon. In the canon we only have pantheism shadowed forth in the half lights of the Upanishads. It is as though the clear expression of monotheism only came in the Jerusalem Talmud, or in the writings of Augustine.

3. The Bible expresses more fully the effect of their religion on the life of the people than does any other body of sacred literature.

Any real religion always has an effect on the life of the people. The effect is usually, not always, good. Religions usually buttress the best recognized morals of the culture in which they exist. They put upon these morals religious sanctions. They also meet in some measure the spiritual needs of man. They would not have lived so long had they not done so. Through them the Logos speaks to men words of the living God; and some men, listening to the words, have come into fellowship with God. Many of us, I am sure, have known people in other religions whom we are glad to recognize as spiritual kinsmen. We have found ourselves more at harmony with them than we have with non-religious persons of our own race. Dr. K. L. Reichelt says in *Truth and Tradition in Chinese Buddhism* (Shanghai 1927), speaking particularly of the "Pure Land" sect, "Some are lost in a disintegrating atheism. But there is also quite a considerable body of monks, nuns and lay Buddhists who throughout their lives show that they are inspired with a spirit of strong spiritual power, so that they not only become good and pious people, but also are a help and blessing to society in general" (p. 156). I could, were this the place, speak of others, of whom the same high testimony might be given. I am, however, not now speaking of what the student of the history of religion finds when he comes in contact with living religions, but of the literature upon which he must largely depend for information. His personal contacts

will usually be few; his contacts through literature will be many.

For the most part, the literature of the great Oriental religions is in a social vacuum. It is sometimes liturgical, sometimes abstractly philosophical or theoretical. Sometimes, however, it expresses the experience of the writers in such a way that the thrill of discovered truth is felt pulsating through it. Such is the quietism which reveals itself in certain books of the Pali Buddhist canon. One feels that a peace has entered the minds of the writers and laid its calming hand on the fevered brow of life. It is akin to Paul's experience, "Wherefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." This feeling of peace is abundantly expressed in the Thera-Theri Gatha, translated by Mrs. Rhys Davids as *Psalms of the Early Buddhists* (London, 1909). Poem after poem ends with expressions of peace, often in the same words. "Cool am I now, knowing Nibbana's peace," is a frequent wording. (See *Psalms of the Early Buddhists:* The Sisters, p. 19, and often.) There is also another delightful little poem, in which, under the allegory of a herdsman resting at night after his day's work is done, is figured the peace of the man who has conquered desire.[3]

One is tempted to dally too long in this attractive field of Buddhist literature. Here are weary wanderers on the path of life who have found the peace that passeth understanding; found it, not in mystic trance, but in the quietistic peace that comes with the knowledge that one has entered upon the path to the greatest good, and need wander aimlessly no longer. It is a very genuine religious experience. We can sympathize with the experience, although we should base it for ourselves upon a different foundation.

But after all, that is only one phase of life. What was the effect of religion upon other phases? What of its effect upon the life of the community, upon the state, upon all

[3] Sutta Nipâta, Dhaniya Sutta, *Sacred Books of the East* (*S. B. E.*), Vol. 10. Also Rhys Davids, *American Lectures:* Buddhism, p. 167 f.

that we include in education, upon the codes of business life and the success of the home, and the ideals by which men live?

In the scriptures of the Oriental religions there are some legal and ethical writings which place conduct and social relations upon a religious basis. Such are the Zoroastrian code in the Vendidad and much else in the Avesta, and the Buddhist collection of precepts, the Dhammapada. Here may be classed the Confucian Li Ki, though that is hardly religious in the usual sense. Outside the canons, but in positions of great authority, are the Hindu Laws of Manu, the Chinese Classic of Filial Piety,[4] and the Taoist Book of Actions and Retributions.[5] One should perhaps mention the Code of Hammurabi and the famous 125th chapter of the Book of the Dead. But even if certain other writings were added, the proportionate amount of such material in any one religion, possibly excepting Zoroastrianism, would be very much less than in the Bible. The religion of the Bible is, to borrow the bad scholastic slang of the day, extravert, not introvert. It is usually looking out upon its world, rather than in upon the mind of the writers. In the Psalms the writers sometimes speak from the depths of their own lives. One finds repentance, trust and peace, expressed—I hope I do not speak the words of prejudice—with more clearness, if not more beauty, than even in the Buddhist literature mentioned above. More often, however, the biblical writers look beyond themselves. No other religion has a literature like that of the prophets, reflecting like a mirror the thoughts of the times; or the narrative writers, interpreting legend and history in terms of religion. To illustrate: Malachi and Nehemiah present, each in his own way, very remarkable pictures of the effects of religion working under the various concrete conditions of actual life. One would have to look far to find anything equaling these small books in the sacred literatures of other religions.

[4] *S. B. E.*, Vol. III.

[5] *S. B. E.*, Vol. XL: T'ai Shang, p. 233–246. Also Chicago, 1906. T'ai Shang Kan-ying P'ien.

4. The literature exhibiting most plainly standards of permanent religious value.

There are certain standards of value upon which most, if not all, religions high enough to produce any literature would unite. They are such as: a clear conception of the Supreme Power, by whatever name it may be named; a plain and open way by which man may come into relation to that Power; the religious expression that we call worship; a conception of the ideal destiny of man; a "way of salvation" by which man may attain that destiny. Here I am not inclined to press the superiority of the biblical literature as I think it can be pressed at other points. I do not think that the Bible states its fundamental standards more clearly than the scriptures of other great religions. If it seems to us to do so, that is probably because of our greater familiarity with it. When I imagine myself coming to the Bible as a new book and opening it at random to find its religious teaching, I sympathize strongly with the Buddhist monk in Nanking who said to me: "I have tried to read the Christian Bible, but I could not understand it. It seemed to me very confused." But I do not think, on the other hand, that the Bible presents its religious standards less plainly than do the scriptures of other religions. As to their being standards of greater religious value, I am quite willing to leave the course of human history to decide.

Laying aside now the general points, may we consider certain special phases of religious history in which the Bible is of particular value.

There is one phase in which the Bible is unique. No other scripture gives the religious biography of a nation. The most fruitful historical classification of religions is into primitive or tribal, national, and personal. All religions run back directly or indirectly into the primitive stage. All high religions are personal, or have strong personal elements. He who would study national religions, however, is driven to the Bible as his source. It is possibly due to this fact that, while we have elaborate studies of primitive religion, and

not less thorough studies of mysticism and other elements in personal religion, the national stage has been much neglected. It is not a necessary factor in the understanding of the Indian religions, of Buddhism, nor even of Islam, and certainly not of Christianity. Confucianism culminates in a fascinating system of state ethics, but it is not national in the sense in which we are using the term.

One feels that Zoroastrianism just missed the national element. In the Gathic hymns there are suggestions of a national situation—other races encroach upon their territories and endanger their flocks. But this nationalism in the religion has two limitations: it relates to only one situation, and it is only stated in these hymns—the prayer-books and laws which make the rest of the Avesta being as blind to national vicissitudes as prayer-books are wont to be. What an opportunity the Persian national history might have offered for religious interpretation! Ahura Mazda was a national god in almost as full a sense as was Jahveh. When Alexander's conquest swept aside the Achaemenian kings there must have been the same sort of religious crisis which met Israel at the exile. The problem of holding faith in their god must have been a real problem. The same situation was duplicated, with probably more intensity, at the Mohammedan conquest. But there was neither a Persian Ezekiel nor Second Isaiah, nor later a Nehemiah, to record the tragedy and hope of the nation's religion. In the Quran there is the consciousness of the Arab people; there is the pride in the city of Mecca and the tense feeling of the sin of her citizens; but there is nothing properly national and, like the Gathic hymns, there is the picture of only one situation. In the Jewish scriptures the national element occupies more than half the material, and covers the entire recorded period of national life.

National religion developes a loftier conception of God than primitive religion held. As the king of a nation becomes more of a personage than the chief of a tribe, so the god of a nation becomes greater than the god of a tribe. He is more remote and lofty, approached with greater respect

and awe. The worship of the god, like the audience of the king, becomes hedged about with formality. This is the stage when great temples, priestly functions, splendid ritual, are natural and right. Now in all the history of the world there is no place where the growth of this kind of deity and his worship are so clearly portrayed as in the Hebrew literature. The tribal stage of the religion remained till after the settlement in Palestine. In Judges 5 the southern tribes are neither summoned nor expected to come to the help of the tribes of the north. The common god served in no effective measure to bind them together. Here is the tribal mental attitude. When at last, under David, the tribes were united, then the national religious attitude arose; and the god became greater. In several ways we can trace the change. One way of detecting it is in the elimination of the cruder anthropomorphism from the older folk-tales. By the time J and E were edited, the national life had placed God on a pedestal of dignity. There seems to have been a growing hesitancy to repeat the old tales in their early form. We are familiar with the use of Malakh Jahveh where, before the story is finished, it becomes evident that Jahveh himself, and no "messenger," figured in the earlier tale. Gideon, discussing the troubles of the country with "Malakh Jahveh" amid the dust of the threshing floor (Judges 6 11); Manoah, conversing with Malakh Jahveh (Judges 13), are illustrations.

Now what had happened in Israel between the time of the Judges and the ninth century, that their original anthropomorphism needed to be shaded down? The greatest thing had happened that could happen to a religion at that stage. It had passed from tribal to national, and God had been placed on a throne of higher majesty. Another mark of the growing greatness of God is the more formal organization of worship. Temple and priesthood flower naturally in the national period. The power of local priesthoods needs no national unity; it has grown on all soils. But the power of a unified, national priesthood is one result of the growth of a nation. The greater God calls for a greater worship, more stately and formal. The elaboration of the worship and the

power of the priesthood act and react on each other, each increment of increased power in one lifting the other a stage higher.

Other elements besides nationalism increase the dignity of worship and the power of the priesthood. In India, during and after the Vedic period, ritualism and priesthood acted and reacted, till the Brahmanas present a religion almost turned magic, and the Brahman caste fastened a priesthood permanently on Indian civilization. The history of Christianity presents another phase of the action and reaction of ritual and priesthood. No other religious history, however, gives any account of the growth of ritual and priesthood as a part of the growth of national religion. This is a unique contribution of Israel.

And how fully the Bible gives the story! How clearly the steps of the development can be traced! The old local shrines of the tribal stage hold their place while the temple at Jerusalem grows in importance from the private shrine of the luxury-loving Solomon to a national religious center. When the time was ripe, the Deuteronomic law swept away the shrines to exalt the temple; but even that might not have been effective without the tragedy of the fall of Jerusalem and the exile. The story of the temple is exceedingly enlightening for the history of national religion.

The shrine which will best compare with this temple is the Altar of Heaven in Peking. That also was a national place of worship. It was the one place in the nation where the highest god was worshipped. But there the likeness ends and contrast begins. This Altar did not represent the triumph of a national priesthood, but was the survival of the pre-priestly stage, when the head of the family or state did the worship for his people. The Emperor sacrificed for the nation. The divine Power, Heaven, there worshipped, became increasingly an abstract principle more than a personal god. Other gods satisfied the religious needs of the people. It is as though in Israel the ritual of the Mosaic day had survived in the temple, the king only worshiping Jahveh twice a year; and the people had developed unhindered their tendency to

Baal worship. The temple would have lost most of its value for the history of religion.

The national tendency to exalt ritual and priesthood had in Israel its checks and balances. One was in the popular worship of the local Baals. It is possible that for a time the growing dignity of the national God may have even increased the influence of the Baals. Jahveh lived above. The Baals lived with the people. Jahveh was the God of Israel's armies. The Baal gave them their corn and wine, if they poured oil on his mazzebah. Another check was the work of the prophets. The tendency of the more formal worship of a greater god is always to transform a living religion into magical forms and priestly fees. It is a great step in progress when national religion lifts a god into greatness, but the next step is over a precipice. This step the prophets succeeded in keeping Israel from taking, but it required all their power to do it. The prophets were themselves ardent nationalists, but their protest was against the fruitage of national religion.

Another unique contribution of the Bible is the record of the growth of personal from national religion. The greatest step in the evolution of religion is that from the institutional to the personal stage. The institution may be tribal, national, or priestly. In any case, the god of the institutional religion holds his relation to man, not directly, but because of man's dependence on, or affiliation with, some other person or group of persons. In India personal religion arose in the midst of a most extreme system of ritualism. It came in two forms, Buddhism and orthodox philosophy. Buddha cut free from institutionalism altogether, and founded a wholly personal religion on the basis of Hindu conceptions. The orthodox religion devised a most ingenious way of meeting the eternal conflict between the institutional and the personal. When a man became old, and his hair grey, and he saw the son of his son, he might leave his home and go into the forest and there seek truth by meditation.[6] This scheme divides life.

[6] *S. B. E.*, Vol. XXV, Laws of Manu, ch. VI, 1 ff.

During the greater part of it man is under the priesthood. In his old age he becomes an individualist. Thus the irreconcilable was reconciled; but it worked only because of indifference. Most men never passed beyond the priestly stage; which was no great matter, for there were numberless incarnations ahead of them. Some, like Buddha, became forest hermits without waiting for old age. The whole history of the rise of personal religion in India is extremely interesting.

In Israel personal religion was born of national religion, was formed within it and nourished by its blood. The whole process of its development is traced for us in the Hebrew literature. Instead of coming from a conflict, personal religion arose and grew and reached its completion among the most devoted and effective champions of nationalism, the prophets. The religion of the prophets was not unique. It rests on a very wide-spread belief that man can do deeds and speak words inspired by deity. Here was the beginning of personal religion. But the prophet did not immediately draw the conclusion that the relation between God and all men was personal, for his own personal relation was only because he was a messenger to the nation. The second step was his conviction that God required righteousness between man and man. Now sin and righteousness are personal. The actions were of individuals, but the prophets promised reward and threatened punishment to the nation, without discrimination between individuals. This could not go on indefinitely. At some time, under some circumstances, the fact that ethics is personal must break up the national tradition of religion, however hoary with age it might be. That time came with the exile. The great step from national to personal religion was taken consciously by the young priest Ezekiel, as he strove to find a new basis for the shattered religion, its national foundations overthrown by the overthrow of the walls of Jerusalem. It came not without preparation. The experiences of many prophets, and the growing sense of individual responsibility for ethical conduct, had paved the way for the new idea. When once it came to clear consciousness,

personal religion was always thereafter an unquestioned factor of Hebrew religion.

How the national factor still persisted; how the two stood side by side without open conflict; how they nevertheless raised problems not always easy to answer; how Christianity dropped the national and kept the personal; these are facts so familiar that I need not dwell on them. What I am interested in emphasizing now is that the Bible lays out for our inspection the fullest and clearest exhibit available of the beginning, development and culmination of this most important step in the growth of religion.

The growth of monotheism furnishes another element of very great value. The biblical record of it is unique in two ways. First, nowhere else can the development of monotheism be so clearly traced. It is easy to see how the earlier prophetic monolatry led to it. The final outburst of clear and uncompromising monotheism in Second Isaiah has no parallel in other literatures. Chemists speak of the nascent state, when a chemical compound, at the moment of its formation, is more potent than at any other time. To catch a religious idea in its nascent state is one of the joys of scholarship; and here it is, for monotheism.

Second, it is the one place where we can trace the growth of an *ethical* monotheism. Other religions have recognized only one Supreme Power in the universe. Sometimes it came from the exaltation of one god above his fellows. Such was the brief interlude of monotheism which Akhnaton interjected in Egypt's polytheism. In India it came as the result of philosophical reasoning on the nature of reality and issued, not in monotheism, but in an impersonal monism. In China it came from the recognition of a single source for the order of the universe. Here, too, the usual interpretation of this Supreme, Tien, Heaven, has been impersonal, though I have met Confucian scholars who disagreed. So does Bruce, in his excellent study, *Chu Hsi and His Masters.*[7] In Japanese Buddhism the impersonal Dharmakaya, drawn ultimately from

[7] J. P. Bruce, London, 1923.

Indian monism, sometimes receives attributes which belong only to a personal God.[8] But in none of these cases is the monotheism primarily ethical in its origin. To see the development of an ethical Supreme Being we must come to the Bible.

Another idea whose growth can be traced in the Bible is that of the love of God. Rising out of the tragedy of life with Hosea, carried on by the Deuteronomic writers, taken into personal religion by the Psalmists, exalted to be the central attribute of God in the New Testament, its history lies open to view. The conception has one counterpart in other religions, although that is a less vivid, fructifying idea. It is the Confucian conception often translated Benevolence, but which seems really to be worthy the name Love.[9] We do not know its history, and its interpretation has been more abstract, less richly human, than the biblical conception of the love of God. This is natural, for Heaven, whose chief attribute it is, has itself been mostly regarded as abstract. Love has been a principle in the universe, setting a standard for the actions of man, not because of loyalty to a personal God, but because "a reasonable being should act reasonably."

Life after death is another belief whose history can be traced in the Bible more fully than in other scriptures. It passes from the idea of a shadowy realm of the dead, common in all primitive religions, to a life where punishment and reward redress the seeming injustices of this world.

Three times religion has developed the idea of a future life ethically related to the present life. Once was the karma of India—a karma working itself out at least partly in reincarnations. Once was the vivid, picturesque ideas of judgment and future life in Zoroastrianism.[10] Once was the Hebrew conception of heaven and hell, more clearly revealed

[8] See Suzuki, *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism*, pp. 223, 232–241. "It is a living spirit that manifests itself in nature as well as in thought" (p. 223). "Dharmakaya is not only an intelligent mind, but a loving heart" (p. 232).

[9] Bruce, *Chu Hsi and his Masters*, pp. 263 ff.

[10] Ardâ Vîrât XVII. See also *S. B. E.*, XXIII, pp. 314 ff., 342 ff.

in the New Testament than in the Hebrew canon itself. The genesis of karma is so obscure that scholars question if it may not be traced to the aborigines of India.[11] The Zoroastrian idea has no history; it appears, no one can tell how or whence, in the literature. The Hebrew idea can be traced through its various stages, from the beginning of the decline of the primitive sheol, to the new and independent belief in life after death.

The Bible student cannot, however, claim as his own the entire range of religious experience. Two elements sometimes found in that experience are, one mostly, the other entirely, wanting. The first is mysticism. The cultivation of the mystic trance is not inculcated. That the prophets sometimes had mystic experiences is well known. These were the by-products of their intense devotion to Jahveh. The prophets never erected them into standards of religious experience. They never said to the people, "You must have these experiences if you would come into relation with God." That is exactly what the real mystic, Hindu, Buddhist, Sufi or Christian, does say. The Bible does not teach mysticism as a necessary religious experience.

The other experience is the approach to God by philosophy. The Bible does not philosophize. No writer in it raises the question of what is reality, or of the relation of the essential substance of man to the essential substance of the universe. That this problem, abstract as it is, may be made the basis of religion, and even of emotional religion, Hindu philosophy shows. That it failed wholly to satisfy human needs is shown by the rise of Buddhism, which in its earlier stages rejected philosophy as not having "to do with the fundamentals of religion,"[12] and by the popular devotion

[11] "While the conceptions of karma and reincarnation are unquestionably the work of the Aryan mind, it need not be denied that the suggestions may have come from the aborigines, who believed that after death their souls lived in animal bodies." Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I, p. 136.

[12] See Warren, *Buddhism in Translation*, p. 122.

to personal gods which India calls *bhakti.* The writers of the Bible do not even reject philosophy; they never consider it. A Hindu said to me: "I think that Christianity is a religion of *bhakti,* and not a religion of philosophy." He was quite right; and the same is true of Judaism.

This paper only touches upon the more obvious aspects of a great subject. There are excellent studies of the religion of the Bible; some of the best of them by members of this Society. I wish to make a plea for the next step in the progress, the treatment of this religion as a part of a wider field. The most important contributions in that field will come, I am confident, from the familiar pages of the Bible. Biblical scholarship will yet bear the leading part in the history of religion.

THE JEWISH BIAS OF PAUL

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

NO one will question the predominantly Jewish character of the Christian movement in the initial stages of its history. Its home was Palestine. Its principal advocates were Jewish peasants. They spoke the Aramaic language, and had no thought of receiving into their fellowship any persons of non-Jewish blood and culture. But as early as the year 50 the new religion had spread to gentile lands where it quickly attracted to itself many converts. Some of these extra-Palestinian congregations were composed of both Jews and Gentiles. The church at Antioch in the time of Paul probably was made up of Jews, proselytes, and uncircumcized Greeks. At Corinth, on the other hand, the membership seems to have been mainly gentile from the start, while the group at Rome apparently included many Jews and proselytes. But within a relatively brief period, the earlier Jewish adherents of Christianity were largely supplanted by Gentiles.

How Christianity, originally a purely Jewish undertaking, became within less than half a century after the death of Jesus a religion of the gentile world at large, is still an inviting problem for the historian. The prominence of Paul in the New Testament literature has led most scholars to seek in him the key to this remarkable transition. His long-famous disputes with the Judaizing Christians of his day, who wished to bring all converts first within the Jewish fold in order to insure for them final salvation through belief on

Christ, has sometimes prompted the assertion that Paul is virtually the founder of gentile Christianity. Or, if he is not strictly its founder, at least he is given credit for comprehending the real intention of Jesus and understanding the implications of Jesus' mission more perfectly than had any previous disciple. If one wishes to claim Jesus as the real author of gentile Christianity, then Paul is its second founder, who quite overshadows the older apostolic leaders whose Semitic leanings are thought to have disqualified them for missionary activity beyond the confines of Judaism.

One might say that it is of the very genius of Protestantism to revere Paul as the great liberator of Christianity from its Jewish bondage. His teaching regarding salvation by faith, in contrast with a salvation to be accomplished through the keeping of the Law, made possible a purely gentile religion; and it is popularly assumed that Paul set Jews aside as radically as gentile Christianity itself has remained separate from Judaism. One is not indeed to affirm that Paul was unaware or unappreciative of the large Jewish heritage that had gone into the making of his new faith. No one doubts that he saw in Christianity the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy, and that he took over the Bible of the Hebrews as wholeheartedly as it has been held during succeeding ages to be a properly Christian possession. On the other hand, it is commonly imagined that Paul believed as completely as did later generations of gentile Christians that God had established the new religion in order to rescue the treasures of revelation from the once chosen people and pass them on to a more efficient guardian, a gentile Christian church.

Again, Protestantism's preference for Paul over Peter has further augmented the disposition to sever the former from his original Jewish connections. The fact that Paul, under the heat of controversy, had affirmed Peter's specific work to be the preaching of the gospel to the Jews, has been taken as sufficient evidence for believing that Peter himself would have accepted this restricted definition of his task or that he at a later date would never have changed his conception of his mission. Then too, the early claim of the Roman

church to have been founded by Peter, who thus insured the supreme authority of the papacy, has proved to be historically so questionable that Peter's possible significance for the spread of Christianity beyond strictly Jewish boundaries has been only tardily appreciated by Protestants. Until within relatively recent times, their prevailing disposition has been to make Paul exclusively the one who deliberately placed himself in the foreground of missionary activity, with the definite purpose of establishing Christianity permanently in a new home among the Gentiles. He, it is thought, had been fully conscious of a conviction that the new enterprise could no longer be regarded as a Jewish affair and that in future it must accomplish its destiny as an increasingly gentile movement.

In the Christianity of Paul there are so many things now known to have been quite un-Jewish, that it is not unnatural for present-day scholarship to emphasize his gentile proclivities rather than to stress his Jewish leanings. Modern research has made it quite evident that the Pauline christology, the Pauline mysticism, and indeed elements of sacramentalism in the Pauline letters, have a much closer kinship with the current religions of the gentile world than they have with contemporary Judaism. The hero of faith whom Paul depicted as crucified and risen is more closely analogous to the hero-saviors of the pagan cults than to any figure discernible in Jewish tradition. Also the emotional experience of the Corinthian group, acting under the permanent endowment of the Holy Spirit, which inspires its members to speak with tongues or display other activities of a highly emotional character, suggests nothing of the sobriety of Jewish worship exemplified in the contemporary synagogues. Then, too, in connection with the Christian rite of baptism and the observance of its religious meal, Paul exhibits sacramental tendencies not to be duplicated in the Jewish religion of his day.

Recognizing the elements of validity in this more recent emphasis on distinctively gentile characteristics within the Christianity of Paul, we might think it all the more apparent

that his fight to liberate the new cause from bondage to the Jewish Law meant for him a conscious effort to establish a movement independent of Judaism, even of Jewish Christianity. Certainly there is no ambiguity in his affirmation of a gentile Christian's independence of the law of circumcision. From the time the question first arises in connection with the activity of the legalists among the Galatian churches, on to the very end of Paul's career, he never wavers in his defense of absolute liberty for gentile converts. A group of such believers, when baptized and endowed by the Holy Spirit and living a life of loyalty to the risen Christ both in public and private activities, constitutes for Paul an entirely legitimate and fully equipped Christian church.

It is perfectly apparent to a modern observer that the logical outcome of Paul's position was the rise of a new gentile church destined to become more and more distinct from Judaism. There is indeed no question regarding the abundant Jewish heritages that passed over into this gentile Christianity. They are too well known and too generally recognized today to call for further emphasis. In releasing these inheritances from subservience to Jewish legalism, Paul may be said to have preserved the noblest features in Judaism, while at the same time he made possible the spread of Christianity to the world at large. Thus he became the exponent of a new religion which, to use Baur's phrase, is "the absolute power of the spiritual life." In the attachment to Christ effected through faith, Paul is said to stand "on a platform where he is infinitely above Judaism, where he has passed far beyond all that is merely relative, limited, and finite in the Jewish religion, and has risen to the absolute religion." (F. C. Baur, *Paul,* Vol. II, pp. 125 f.) Later scholarship has modified somewhat the statement of Baur, yet there is still a prevailing disposition to make Paul deliberately sever the new cause from its earlier Jewish connections.

Does this truly represent the apostle's state of mind? Does he think that Christianity is ultimately to become a religion whose membership will be composed exclusively of gentile

converts? Does it seem to him that Judaism has been forever superseded and that the promises made by God in times of old to his chosen people have now been transferred to men of a different race? Are we to infer that his struggle to free gentile converts from the law of circumcision was thought by him to be the first step in the founding of a new religion to transcend and supplant Judaism?

In the composition of his letters, Paul was not often called upon by the circumstances to make discriminating pronouncements upon this subject. Yet he has on occasion expressed himself very definitely to the effect that he regards the climax of Christianity's success to belong emphatically in the Jewish rather than in the gentile area of religious realization. His statements in the ninth to the eleventh chapters of the Epistle to the Romans are known to everybody, although they are not so frequently cited in this connection as are such chapters as the seventh of Romans and the second of Galatians. But Paul himself is fully convinced that the temporary hesitation of Israel in receiving the gospel is a condition presently to be reversed. In the meantime the Gentiles are having the advantage of hearing the missionary preachers. But Paul stoutly affirms that in the new scheme of things God has not cast off his chosen people, nor have the religious treasures revealed to them in the past been handed over to new guardians. Jewish Christians are to be the main trunk of the gospel tree, while Gentiles are only engrafted branches.

Again, Paul's outlook upon the future clearly reveals the strength of his Jewish proclivities. Missionary work among Gentiles is a temporary activity which must be brought to a conclusion as hastily as possible in order that the great consummation to be effected by Jesus' return and the establishment of the eschatological kingdom may be realized. The time is short; the Lord is at hand. Indeed, Paul can believe that the preaching of Christianity has been adequately done in all the territory from Jerusalem round about to Illyricum before the year 60 (Rom. 15 19). Now Paul is ready to pass on to Spain, which is to be the final outpost of the gentile

mission. We may assume that he thinks others have preached or are preaching sufficiently at Rome, Alexandria, and other important centers about the Mediterranean. He could hardly have supposed that these hasty missionary activities had established a Christianity to endure for centuries as a successful rival to and an ultimate victor over all the heathen religions of the Roman Empire. What Paul assumed was that he and his fellow-laborers were giving the Gentiles the full measure of opportunity which God had designed them to have. The great Christian triumph was to be distinctly a Jewish affair, to which a few Christian Gentiles would be admitted with full privileges. But the stage of this consummation certainly was to be Palestine, undoubtedly Jerusalem itself. It was there that Christ would appear to "deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power" (1 Cor. 15 24). Then Christ himself will cease to exercise even his own authority, which is now uniquely manifest in the Christian communities where the missionaries are laboring, but which in the time of the consummation is to be completely surrendered to God; "then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. 15 28).

The Tübingen scholars and their followers, in making him so emphatically the advocate of an absolute religion for the gentile world at large, have passed too lightly over the Jewish leanings of Paul. They turned the spotlight effectively upon his controversy with the legalists, but unfortunately they left other important aspects of the apostle's thought and interest quite too much in the shadow. Indeed, one might question whether Paul's contention for the freedom of gentile Christians from the Mosaic law of circumcision was so primary and fundamental in his own consciousness as it has been made to seem by the majority of his modern interpreters. Apparently the outbreak of the controversy itself was something of an accident and quite surprising to both Paul and Barnabas. This situation would not give us the impression that Paul immediately upon his conversion had

thought through the whole issue, making it the basal concept of his new faith and building about it a distinctive system of Christian theology.

One might say that for Paul the legalistic controversy had been forced upon him by an unhappy accident. The social situation conditioning his efforts to win the Jews of the Dispersion to Christ had necessitated the habit of associating with gentile friends, made first among the class of "God-fearers" and later from people quite outside the Jewish synagogue. When violently treated by his Jewish kinsmen but received favorably into the house of a Gentile, who already had experienced under Paul's preaching the same type of spiritual elevation that Paul himself enjoyed, the apostle is not likely to have concerned himself very seriously with the question of a gentile convert's circumcision. That issue was forced upon him from without by the more conservative and less widely experienced believers of Palestine. The practice of freedom had automatically established itself in the Pauline communities, but now that it was subjected to attack a formal justification of the procedure had to be devised. This was the setting that threw into the foreground of attention the controversy over faith as a sufficient substitute for obedience to the Law. One might quite reasonably doubt whether that issue, as a definitely focal point in the Christian scheme of things, had previously been deliberately faced by Paul. His conversion experience had been, not primarily a matter of theological reflection, but an immediate sense of attachment to the risen Lord, who had miraculously appeared to him on the road to Damascus. To portray this risen Jesus triumphant over the cross and the grave, and immediately powerful through the operations of the Holy Spirit in the life of the disciples, was the central theme of the Pauline missionary preaching. Even after the legalistic controversy had been forced upon him, he could still epitomize the whole Christian message in the statement: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (Rom. 10 9).

Paul's vehemence in contending for the rights of faith over the demands of the legalists has served excellently the cause of a predominantly gentile Christianity in later ages. Perhaps it is not unnatural to assume that he had designed this result; and also that the didactic technique which he later employed to meet a specific situation had been fundamental with him from the very outset. But such is probably not the case. The evidence that Paul had no other outlook for Christianity than that it should share in an early triumph of the Jewish people through the return of a distinctly Jewish Savior, Jesus the exalted Messiah, to fulfil an unmistakably Jewish type of eschatological expectation, seems perfectly clear from abundant data contained in the Pauline letters. At best, freedom from the law of circumcision applied only to gentile believers, and these constituted in Paul's day by no means the majority, or at least it was not his intention that in future the gentile converts should outnumber the Jews who would be loyal to the triumphant Christ. In this respect we may say that Paul had an emphatically Jewish bias.

That radical change of perspective by which Christianity came to regard itself as an affair of the gentile world, with the Jews largely rejected from its privileges, was an attainment not of the Pauline but of the post-Pauline age, and the bridge by which the new religion crossed from Palestine to the gentile world was not that of Pauline anti-legalism. There were in fact two other routes which proved far more attractive. One favored way of justifying the gentile character of the new religion was to stress a literal fulfilment and keeping of the Law, an attitude quite out of harmony with Paul's feeling. This disposition had already manifested itself in his day among the Romans and had called forth his sharp rebuke. But ultimately it found effective and permanent expression for the Christian church in the Gospel of Matthew. Here the full Jewish Scriptures became a strictly Christian authority, fulfilled and supplemented by the legislation of the new lawgiver, Jesus, who is thus the authentic successor and interpreter of Moses. The Jewish people have now been

completely ejected from their heritage, while the Christian ideal of conduct is absolute conformity to this ancient revelation rebaptized in accordance with distinctively Christian interests.

Still a second expedient, very successfully employed in effecting Christianity's transition from Jewish to gentile soil, was the representation of the earthly Jesus as an incarnation of deity. This is effectively accomplished in the Fourth Gospel. It is safe to say that Paul would have sharply disagreed with this book had it been known in his day, just as he would have disagreed with the Gospel of Matthew. But his disagreement with the Johannine gospel would have been for a different reason. Probably we are right in feeling that the Fourth Gospel is closer in spirit to Paul than is the Gospel of Matthew. Yet there is no ignoring the fact that its author has very radically altered the Pauline type of eschatology, and is much more severe than the apostle ever was in criticism of the Jewish people. The point of agreement between Paul and John lies mainly in the idea of Christ's preexistence. But when it comes to the incarnation of this preexistent being, immediately the respective opinions of the apostle and the evangelist radically diverge.

Paul's incarnate Savior is entirely subordinated to the Hebrew God, and displays while upon earth traits of remarkable humility. When he triumphs over death it is not through his own virtue, and even his later exercise of heavenly lordship over the Christian community is a gift that has been bestowed upon him by God. It is God who has highly exalted him and given him the name that is above every name. Paul could hardly have condemned Jewish contemporaries of Jesus for failing to perceive that he was to be their glorious Savior. They had known him only after the flesh, and such acquaintanceship had not been designed to produce obedience and adoration. That attitude had been made possible only through the crucifixion and subsequent happenings. Paul never asked his audiences to believe on an earthly Jesus. Salvation was conditioned solely upon belief in a heaven-exalted Christ. That the establishment of gentile

Christianity was to be justified on the ground of Jewish rejection of the earthly Jesus was not a fundamental Pauline conception.

On the other hand, for the author of the Fourth Gospel, the justification for gentile Christianity lay exactly in the fact that the earthly Jesus had made so brilliant a display of his heavenly credentials that the failure of his Jewish contemporaries to believe in him was the peculiar sin that marked them for eternal doom. Jesus is represented as exhibiting even while on earth an equality with the Hebrew God that probably would have been quite distasteful to Paul, even to Paul the devout Christian. The Johannine picture would have wounded his Jewish sensibilities. But for the Fourth evangelist, the earthly Jesus seems entirely justified in making himself one with Deity, a prerogative that even the preexistent Christ of Paul's faith might not fittingly covet. But for many Gentiles the Johannine Christ, being an actual incarnation of divinity, was a much more suitable figure in whom to trust for salvation, than was either the new Moses of the first evangelist or the Pauline apocalyptic Messiah destined the moment his triumph was complete to surrender everything to the God of the Jews.

Students have often noted the relative absence of specifically Pauline influence on the gentile Christianity of the second generation. If we regard Paul as the real founder of the gentile church, or even as its "second founder," his failure to dominate more effectively his immediate successors is a puzzling phenomenon. This difficulty becomes more easily explicable, however, when one recognizes the strong Jewish bias of Paul and the utter absence from his thinking of any intention to establish a permanent gentile Christianity. But in later times when the new movement had made itself fully at home among Gentiles and cherished the ideal of a complete break with Judaism, it found in Paul two serious embarrassments. He was too anti-biblical and too pro-Jewish. In defending his practice of admitting Gentiles into Christianity without requiring circumcision, he had developed a dangerous attitude in favor of ignoring certain

portions of those Scriptures which had now become the great charter of the growing gentile church. Also, in picturing the missionary program as the ingathering of a few gentile converts to join the great host of Jewish redeemed who would greet Christ at his coming, Paul had inverted the process of historical development that was now daily verifying itself more and more clearly in the actual experience of the second generation of gentile Christians. They still looked for Christ's advent, but they, and not the men of Jewish blood, were to inherit the kingdom.

If we have correctly read Paul's mind it was not his intention to found a predominantly gentile Christianity, but to help rescue a few Gentiles who were privileged by the generosity of the Hebrew God to share in the blessings of salvation that still belonged peculiarly to the Jewish race. But on this assumption how are we to account for the manifestly Hellenistic features that characterize Pauline Christianity? Our answer is that they are expedients, like his argument against circumcision, employed to induce Gentiles to share, and help to bring to realization, the perfect Judaism, as Paul might have called Christianity. Had he remained a rabbi of the Dispersion, possibly he would have followed a similar line of procedure in persuading Gentiles to share God-ordained privileges with the future of the Jewish race. We have no reason to suppose that his zeal for missionary propaganda was a peculiarly Christian acquisition. It is true that if he had not accepted Christ he would have found it more difficult to furnish his audiences with the figure of a hero-savior capable of making a successful appeal to Gentiles. But his conversion to belief in the lordship of the risen Jesus did not necessarily involve any radical change in the relative status of Gentile and Jew in God's scheme of redemption. It simply made the eternal purposes of the Almighty more easy of realization. Perhaps, indeed, just because Paul had always been of the opinion that a select number of Gentiles were to inherit Jewish privileges, did he find it possible to adapt himself to gentile ways. Both his abandonment of circumcision and his borrowings from the Hellenistic cults

are glowing testimony to the seriousness with which he undertook to make known to Gentiles the kindly attitude of the Hebrew God toward a less favored people. The more closely he came to grips with this task the more effective in his hands did he find the characteristic tools of gentile religions to be. By this process, though probably quite unawares, Paul was being transformed into a Greek religionist, but he himself had no thought of disloyalty to that true Judaism which he conceived his Christianity to be.

JESUS' ATTITUDE TO THE LAW OF MOSES

HARVIE BRANSCOMB
DUKE UNIVERSITY

THE editor of the Book of Acts has attempted to eliminate as far as possible from the story of the early church all traces of disagreement and conflict; but even if we did not have the letters of Paul, this picture would be corrected by the variety and divergence of sayings about the Mosaic law attributed to Jesus by our Synoptic Gospels. Not only does one find expressed both extreme positions, but a number of intermediate ones as well. One can construct a sort of chromatic scale made up of the alleged sayings of Jesus in which all the notes are struck from the complete rejection of the law to its complete affirmation. Thus it is presented that Jesus declared the law and the prophets to have ceased with John; that he gave a new law of his own which was the completion of the old; that he merely rejected certain specific commandments while affirming the rest; that he rejected all the oral law but strongly maintained the written code; and finally that he demanded obedience to the whole law including the decisions of the scribes who he declared "sit in Moses' seat."

In such a situation one turns hopefully to a source analysis of the material, but in vain. Though much is learned of the attitudes of the several editors and of the social experience of the Christian circles from which the collections came, such an analysis yields no final conclusion. Within the several strata the same divergent material is to be found.

Thus we are thrown back upon the content of Jesus'

teaching for the solution of the problem. In particular, there are three approaches which seem fruitful: first, we must study the use which Jesus makes of the written and oral law apart from all controversial occasions. In the second place, neglecting still in large degree the formal utterances about the law, we may study the issues which arose between Jesus and the representatives of orthodox Judaism, thus determining for ourselves the actual relationship. In the third place, it is perhaps possible to secure from the obscure history of the early church, and in particular from the behavior of Peter, results which throw some light upon our problem. I need not add that it is only because of the fresh light cast upon these approaches during recent years by outstanding scholars that I have the temerity to venture upon so long contested a field.

The basis from which the solution must start has long been recognized and is abundantly established by the first of the above approaches. Jesus was the child of the synagogue and he regarded the Scriptures as the revelation of God's will. He quotes from all three of its divisions as from verbally inspired scripture. He specifically declared that David spoke one of the psalms "in the Holy Spirit." To one who asks how to gain eternal life he is content to reply, "Thou knowest the commandments." To a scribe who cites passages from the law he says plainly, "Do this and thou shalt live." He attended the synagogue regularly, probably wore the *zizith* upon his garments, and paid the Temple tax. For the Temple, he had great reverence, declaring that God dwelt in it. One who had been reconciled with his brother should return and offer his gift. His outlook is limited to the people of Israel. The word "Gentiles" connotes those in religious ignorance, even if nothing more opprobrious. In a saying which must be genuine, he declared that he "was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel," and there is no clear evidence that he ever enjoined upon his disciples a mission to the Gentiles. This material, most of it preserved indirectly and without reference to the controversy over the law, must always be our point of departure.

But Jesus did not appear primarily as a teacher. This was only incidental to a larger vocation. He was conscious of a prophetic call to awaken Israel to her need of repentance in preparation for the manifestation of God's sovereignty which Jesus saw sweeping upon them. He set himself to bring the irreligious, the publicans and sinners, the outcast, to a realization of the impending judgment and the joyous kind of life which acceptance of God's sovereignty involved. "I came not to call the righteous but sinners," "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep." His disciples are to become "fishers of men."

Such seeking of the sinner was not characteristic of Judaism, but this is Jesus' mission or vocation. It reveals to us what we may expect to find central in his thought. There will be a positive character to his view of righteousness, the accompaniment of his own prophetic mission.

What this coming sovereignty of God implied for men is made clear by his ethical teaching. Fundamentally, he conceived of goodness as a new will in the individual which strives to be like that of the Heavenly Father. The rule of God demands a spirit of obedience in the inner life which loves one's neighbor as oneself, forgives enemies, creates peace, hungers and thirsts after righteousness, sacrifices all for the sake of the Kingdom. In this positive side of his teaching we do not find Jesus urging the ritual or levitical commandments of the Torah. In his thought they do not appear as necessary elements in that obedience to God's will which he went about urging men to perform. And this obedience in love and service must be limitless, nothing must deter or prevent it.

Thus Jesus, though pointing his hearers to the commandments, had in his own thinking departed from the legal conception of duty. On the one hand he carried goodness constantly back to the motive or spirit. And on the other hand he shows no interest in a large number of precepts plainly commanded in the text. In a word, in practice he makes certain very general moral attitudes the standard of right action, which of course is quite different from the conception of a revealed law.

It has been suggested that what Jesus did was to reject the oral law while maintaining the validity of the text of the Scriptures, and this view is presented in one passage in Mark (Mk. 7 6-13). It is true that most of the controversies recorded in the Gospels involve rulings of the oral law, an inevitable fact since the oral law was in great part the authoritative definition of what the written code meant in practice. The attention of Jesus would, therefore, be directed first of all to this scribal interpretation. In the issues which arose between himself and the official teachers, Jesus felt intuitively that he was obeying God's will; but they in their turn could cite the unanimous tradition of the elders as to the meaning of Torah. In such cases, there was nothing left for him to do except to declare by implication at least that the tradition was wrong. It is clear, therefore, that by refusing to accept the rulings of the scribes as to the correct *halacha,* he denied in principle the basic assumption of the oral law, that an unbroken tradition was of divine authority. But another fact is also of importance. Jesus was untrained in the schools. He did not have the weapons with which to meet his critics on their own ground and answer with authority. But the law and prophets he did know. In the controversies which arose, therefore, he would turn naturally to this authority to answer tradition with citations of Scripture.

General considerations make it probable, then, that some such utterance as Mark 7 8 came to expression, namely, that the scribes and Pharisees, leaving the commandment of God, were keeping ofttimes a human tradition. But a reading of the documents leaves a very considerable doubt that he made so sweeping a generalization as to throw the whole oral law into the discard. One receives the impression that it is more probable that he declared the particular scribal rulings which he felt to be counter to the will of God to be resting upon a human and unauthoritative tradition. The reasons for this are the following:

(1) Jesus shows the same independence and freedom in dealing with commandments of the written law. Our formula

of explanation, therefore, cannot be the simple proposition that he rejected the oral law but accepted the written. Whatever his attitude to the law was, it involved discrimination and selection within the text of scripture as well as within the tradition.

(2) It is only in the *Korban* saying that Jesus makes choice of the right action on the basis of a distinction between what is oral tradition and what is written law. Though the distinction seems to us to lie ready to hand and to be a complete answer to his critics on several occasions, he does not employ it but takes higher ground. On other occasions it is to well-known rulings of the oral law itself that he turns, arguing that these embody the principles of right action.

(3) It is obvious that with much of the oral law Jesus was in the most profound agreement. The mitigation of the severity of the criminal codes, the laws permitting the saving of life upon the Sabbath, the substitution of fines for the literal lex talionis, the deepening of the moral commands into the realm of motive, the Shammaite insistence on a limited divorce,—these are only illustrations from many which might be cited. Indeed, one could plausibly argue from the "Antitheses" of the fifth chapter of Matthew that Jesus rejected the written law but affirmed the oral commandments.

(4) In spite of the appeal that the view under consideration would make to a church which kept the Jewish Scriptures but broke with the Pharisees, there is no indication outside Mark that Jesus took this position. Not even in the so-called "Woes to the Pharisees" is the oral law declared to be abrogated, the nearest approach to this being the statement that the scribes lay heavy burdens upon the shoulders of men.

(5) Finally, one recalls the presence in the tradition of those sayings which affirm the binding authority of all the oral law. Jesus may not have said, "The scribes sit in Moses' seat, whatsoever they tell you do and keep," but that such sayings could be ascribed to him surely indicates that he took no open and unequivocal stand in favor of the position of the Sadducees.

It would appear then that Jesus treated the oral law, as he did also the written law, with the fearless freedom of a prophet. He felt that he knew what God wanted of men, that he was teaching the true Torah, and that the scribes in many cases had not interpreted it aright. In many cases he answers tradition with Scripture, in some cases his appeal is to the oral law. In principle he rejected the oral law, but this denial was probably the implication of his own inner freedom rather than a theological premise with which he began.[1]

Within the text of Scripture, he also discriminated. The law of Sabbath work is subject to the demands of human need. The divorce decree of Moses is not God's will. In these cases there is a conflict between elements which lay side by side in the Torah.

How far did Jesus carry this rejection of portions of the Torah? Did he utter Mark 7 15, and if so in what sense? Against its authenticity there is the weighty argument that if Jesus had said it, the struggle in the early church over the law, and in particular over eating with the Gentiles, could never have occurred. One feels also the force of the argument that it carries one too far from that reverence for the Scriptures which we have seen was characteristic of Jesus. It may be that the saying is a product of the struggle in the church; certainly one would hesitate to be dogmatic. But I would point out the following facts:

(1) That Jesus' habit of eating with publicans and sinners shows an indifference to the question of whether or not food was clean. He probably was not served forbidden foods, but

It is significant that Albertz in his investigation, *Die Synoptischen Streitgespräche* (Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1921) is able to write: "Surprising is it that proof from Scripture is only rarely, in part only secondarily drawn upon. Of the seventeen (conflict) discourses, eight omit all reference to Scripture, another connects itself only in form to the Scriptures . . . only eight offer anything like a Scripture proof. Furthermore of these eight a number are not real proofs from Scripture, as for example the citations in answer to the Temptation . . . Thus Jesus shows no habit of going to Scripture for his answers to questions" (p. 72 f.).

Pharisaism insisted that one could never know that the food served on such a table was properly killed and properly prepared. If one went into the house of a sinner or a Gentile one faced presumptive defilement. Jesus regarded such a risk apparently as of no importance.

(2) Acts and Galatians show us that this is exactly the position of Peter until the time when "those from James" remonstrated with him—perhaps as the leading apostle to the Jews. Peter stayed at the house of Simon, the tanner, an outcast by occupation; he ate with Cornelius; he ate freely with the Gentiles at Antioch, and Paul's public rebuke to him there reads: "If thou being a Jew livest as a Gentile, and not as the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?"[2] In connection with this I would also remark that Paul's discussion of this subject in Galatians is to the effect that the early church was by no means meticulous in their observance of the Law until there came in later "false brethren to spy out the liberty which we have in Christ Jesus." Was it not just this looseness as to the law which aroused Paul the Pharisee to his task of persecution?

(3) We have closely related evidence as to Jesus' attitude toward foods from other passages in the Gospels. On the one hand we are told in two sources that Jesus and his disciples refused to adopt a custom of handwashing before meals. The exact nature of the rite is in some doubt, but the fact of the episode can hardly be doubted and throws light upon Jesus' lack of interest in the cleanness or uncleanness of foods. Furthermore, there are preserved two forms of an earlier Aramaic tradition that Jesus declared that vessels could not make food unclean provided the one who ate was clean of heart.

(4) The struggle in the early church over the law centered primarily on the issue of circumcision. This is the testimony both of Paul's letters—see especially Gal. 2 3-7; 5 2; 1 Cor. 7 18, 19—and of the Book of Acts (15 1). We would expect, there-

[2] Galatians 2 14: Εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς ζῇς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαικῶς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαίζειν;

fore, a logion, the origin of which is to be traced to Gentile Christianity's consciousness of freedom from the law, to deal rather with this central issue of circumcision.

In the light of these facts it is not so clear that Mark 7 15 is a later addition to the story, though it may not have been couched in quite so sweeping a form as we now have it. It probably was uttered in connection with some controversy such as that over vessels, or over presumptive defilement in the houses of sinners or over food eaten with unwashed hands, to which controversy it is now related in our text. In the last case, we may see a reason why the saying plays no part in the controversy over the law until at a later date, for rabbinic scholars are agreed that the cleansing of hands before eating was at this time not a requirement of the law for laymen. But in any case we may feel sure from the analogy of other cases that Jesus' thought on this topic was along lines that have been outlined—that foods and the rules about them were not vitally involved in that obedience of the heart which God desired. A generation later a great rabbi, Johanan ben Zakkai, uttered the same thought: "A corpse does not defile nor water make clean," though his training, his logic and his philosophy made him add: "but it is a command of the King of Kings."[3] It is just this addition which represents the difference between Jesus and the rabbis in their attitude toward the law.

Judaism had inherited from the more primitive stage of its history a collection of laws dealing with all aspects of the nation's life, and these laws had become invested with the sanctity of the divine revelation. Professor Moore has recently shown how the scribes were gradually transforming these laws along lines of the teachings of the prophets, using the principle of interpretation by the oral law as their instrument. But Judaism was retarded in this development by two factors which were both its strength and its weakness. On the one hand, religion was socially interpreted, and the individual conscience thus was subject to correction by the rulings of

[3] *Tanḥuma* ed. Buber, Ḥukkat § 26, and elsewhere.

the majority of scribes. In the second place, the scribes were scholars, men of the classroom, men who insisted on the test of logic. But in the light of the premises as to the law which Judaism had inherited, logic was not perhaps the most valuable tool for religion. The scribes were eminently logical in their criticisms of Jesus. They pointed out that he accepted the Torah but disregarded or eliminated certain sections of it. Jesus was a man of the people. He was untrained in the schools. He was not a theologian nor a doctor of the law. He was engaged in a mission of great urgency and moral intensity. His message came from his own conscience; he submitted it to no earthly authority, but the elements out of which it was built were in the Torah. Thus he did not appear teaching a new law, as the early Church liked to picture him, but as teaching Torah in its real nature. He did not begin with certain premises and make logical consistency the test of truth. He began rather, I think, with the commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord, Thy God, with all thy heart and thy neighbor as thyself," and he made ethical consistency with that principle his test. Judaism was struggling toward the expression of this ideal in its manifold law, but it needed the prophet of the people to break through its shackles to the past.[4]

[Editor's note: A vital point in the discussion of this subject, particularly in the use of Mark, our earliest witness, is the fact that in Jesus' debate with the scribes in Mk. 7 1-23 the distinction between the *torah* of God and "ordinances of men" is made basic (so again Mk. 10 2-9) *with explicit appeal to "Isaiah"* (quoting Is. 29 13). It may be worthy of note that Paul (Col. 2 22) and the Nazarenes of Aleppo in the time of Apollinarius of Laodicea and Jerome (*Comm. ad loc.*) made the same application of the same passage.]

[4] The views presented in this article will be presented in fuller detail in a forthcoming volume on the topic.

PETER'S VISION OF THE RISEN CHRIST

SELBY VERNON McCASLAND
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THERE is no room for dogmatizing about the nature of the experience of Simon Peter when he saw Jesus alive again and became persuaded that he had risen from the dead. We may not hope to attain ultimate finality in the interpretation. But there is no reason why the study may not be kept within the limits of a strictly empirical method, and that is the best instrument, even with all of its well recognized inadequacies, that science has yet been able to devise. The explanations of the visions of the early disciples that have been suggested in the past may be stated under three heads: the objective manifestation to the physical senses of men who were still living a normal physical life of a living spiritual being that had survived the death of the physical body; the so-called telegram from heaven, suggested by Keim;[1] and the subjective vision, which is really a visual hallucination, in which the object is real to the seer but has no objective reality.

I

The traditional interpretation from the beginning has held that Jesus survived the grave as a spiritual being and made himself known to the disciples on various occasions; and in recent times this theory has been supported by some who do not hold the usual traditional view of the Bible, but claim

[1] *Jesus of Nazara* (1883), vol. vi, p. 364.

to be empirical scientists, who undertake to demonstrate the theory by the séances of spirit mediums.[2] But no one can make the assumption which has underlain the traditional view, that departed spirits have objective ontological existence and are able to make themselves known to living persons, or that one has done that in the past, and make claim to an empirical method, for that method does not start with such assumptions.

This does not deny the right of faith to believe the traditional assumption but simply that science has a right to make it. And those who have attempted to prove their case by recourse to the séance have not yet succeeded. This is, no doubt, a legitimate field for investigation and the scientist should explore it, but no finality has been reached thus far, at least none that has been accepted by the recognized psychologists.[3] Lake allows for the possibility that this type of investigation may take the study of the resurrection in the future into a new field or place it upon a different plane.[4] But thus far it is pointed out that the phenomena of spiritism have explanation according to the recognized principles of psychology; the communications from the dead may be due to the reawakening of communications that have taken place before death and have lain dormant in the subconscious phase of personality.[5] This is in harmony with the neutral theory of the subconscious.

Moreover, the entire assumption on which the conception of communication with the dead rests is the primitive idea of human nature, when it was thought that personality was of more than one distinct part; that the soul lived in the body as a dwelling place until death, and then continued its life in other places; that the soul's life was by no means

[2] F. W. H. Meyers, *Human Personality and its Survival beyond the Grave;* Lodge, *Hibbert Journal*, April 1908; Hoffmann, *Das Geheimnis der Auferstehung Christi* (1925).

[3] George A. Coe, *The Psychology of Religion*, 1918, p. 292.

[4] Lake, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Christ*, 1907, p. 265.

[5] Coe, *op. cit.* p. 202; Lake, *op. cit.* pp. 253 ff.

conditioned by that of the body, but lived independently in and of itself. So since the soul continued to live after the death of the body it was believed that it could make communications to other souls still living in bodies. But modern psychology has discarded this old view of human nature. It sees personality as a unit. There are no compartments that exist separately in and of themselves. It simply recognizes different phases of personality and of consciousness. There may be more to personality than this, but empirical psychology has not discovered it. And until that discovery takes place the idea of a continued existence of the soul after death, while by no means disproven to faith, can be no more than an assumption, and, therefore, may not be used as a premise for the empirical explanation of historical phenomena. So either on the traditional basis or on that of the modern scientific investigator of the basis of spirit phenomena, the theory of the objective revelation of the departed spirit of Jesus to his disciples cannot be accepted as the basis for the explanation of the vision of Peter and of his companions.

II

And the same conclusion must be reached in the case of the "telegram from heaven," suggested by Keim. It has exactly the same psychological difficulties as the objective appearance theory. There have been no scientific proofs of such a possibility as spirits sending telegrams from heaven back to their friends on earth; and the modern language in which it is clothed suggests that, likely, the ancients could not have conceived of such a theory before the invention of the electrical devices for sending messages by wireless. There was no such way of thinking in that ancient world. Rather, the disciples believed that Jesus came to them personally and delivered the messages face to face, so that he was present to their physical senses. And Keim's suggestion is not free from difficulties on other grounds. It really means that there was no appearance of Jesus at all, that the disciples did not see him, but that Jesus created for them, the false impression

that he was present with them although he was in reality not there. This suggestion of Keim's has not met with a warm response even from the conservative side because of this very difficulty. Bruce calls it "a bastard supernaturalism as objectionable to unbelievers as the true supernaturalism of the Catholic creed, and having the additional drawback that it offers to faith asking for bread a stone."[6]

III

The only theory that is thus left as a scientific explanation of the vision of Peter and the others is that they were in some way subjective productions of consciousness. The visions really occurred and were very real to the disciples, and psychology would not deny the possibility even that they were produced by the presence of Jesus in objective ontological reality, after his survival from the grave, but it holds, simply, that the visions may be explained according to well known laws which do not require an objective presence to account for a subjective experience. The subjective experience may be produced by a subjective stimulus and, in spite of that, have all the reality for the seer of phenomena produced by an external stimulus.[7] A vision of this nature is the product of the psychical condition of the seer. A high tension of mental excitement and emotion lead him into an experience in which he becomes aware in his consciousness of something as present which in fact has no objective existence before him at the time of the vision. Moreover, the materials of which the vision is composed were previously in his mind and have engaged its activities. Under the influence of the proper stimuli, then, as soon as the psychical condition necessary is attained, a vision which has no objective reality is just as capable of explanation by psychological laws as are the normal visions and sensations produced by objective reality, which are due to the functioning of the bodily senses while under no

[6] Bruce, *Apologetics* (1892), p. 393.

[7] Schmiedel, *Ency. Bib.* col. 4078. But note my own estimate of the limitation of the present scientific method at the close of this research.

abnormal nervous or emotional strain. Therefore, to explain the vision of Peter on this basis it must be shown that there were previously in his mind the materials out of which the vision was constructed, and that his psychical condition was such as to make the vision possible.

IV

In the first place, the gospels furnish us quite a clear outline of the character of Peter and give a record of his connection with Jesus from the very beginning of the ministry to the end. There is no reason to doubt that we have a reasonably trustworthy picture of him. Peter was the first disciple of Jesus. He was called from his nets by the sea of Galilee. He was the leader of that intimate group of disciples which Jesus gathered to himself during his lifetime. He shared all the great experiences in the life of Jesus, the preaching of the kingdom which was just at hand, the ecstatic experience of the transfiguration, the casting out of demons, the healings, the arrest, the trial and death. Not only was he present through all these unusual experiences as the most intimate friend of Jesus, but in the greatest crisis of all he denied his relationship with Jesus. He was of an emotional temperament. He was very impressionable, responsive and subject to the domination of highly wrought nervous complexes. He was the first to affirm his devotion until death, possibly the first to flee, but, at the same time he was very tender-hearted, and wept for his weakness; he was the first to regain his courage after the ordeal was over and revived the courage of his brethren. He was a man of high spiritual idealism and devotional loyalty, but, also, would yield easily to fear in the presence of physical danger. Peter's weakness is evident, also, from the statement of Paul in Galatians 2 11-14, where Paul rebukes him for his lack of courage in compromising his convictions. Not only in the life of Jesus but in the early years after the resurrection, Peter was the leader in the ecstatic experiences in the life of the church. He was the spokesman at Pentecost, he was connected with the stories in Acts in which the holy Spirit worked with power, sending death, or

healing the sick, just as Jesus had done in the earlier days. Now, it is not necessary to accept the actual historicity of the details of all these records here; but the very fact of the existence of the records and of Peter's connection with them is significant as to his ecstatic nature.

So with the type of man in mind that Peter was, we are able to picture the tremendous emotional strain under which he must have labored after he had denied his master through fear, and, yet, was driven to deepest penitence by his intense devotion and fundamental uprightness, when he realized that the master whose intimate fellowship he had enjoyed all these years as his closest friend, had gone to the cross alone. He had upon his sensitive spirit the weight of his own failure in loyalty to his master in his time of greatest need; at the same time, he had the reproof of his master's courage under trial; and, last of all, the terrible tragedy of the cross clung in his mind with increasing pathos. The weight of it all drove his fevered consciousness to the verge of insanity itself, into that uncertain borderland of irresponsibility and irrationality, where the normal controls of conscious action dissolve and are supplanted by those primal forces which break forth in chaos out of the confusion of a deranged and disorganized personality. He could not shake off the feeling of reproach and self-condemnation that settled over him at the cross. But the days of the feast were over at last, and he set his face again toward the Galilean home where Jesus had called him from his nets in days gone by to become a fisher of men. Now he went back to those nets again.[8]

V

But what materials could Peter have had in his mind, out of which a vision of Jesus alive again could have been

[8] Mark 16 7 indicates that Peter's vision was in Galilee; the Johannine appendix and the gospel of Peter (xiv: 60, M. R. James, pp. 90 ff.) indicate that Peter was back with his nets again when the vision occurred. Gardner-Smith, *The Narratives of the Resurrection* (1926), pp. 140–170, has a good discussion of the point involved here.

onstructed? We must not think here in terms of the highly eveloped doctrine of the resurrection held by the later hurch, as shown in the gospels, or even in Paul, when we hink of Peter's vision. It is not a cult-lord that he sees, or a potential apocalyptic Messiah seated at God's right and, but simply the spirit of his departed friend, whom he ad left to die alone on the cross just a few days before in erusalem. The vision showed him that Jesus was still alive. t is impossible, of course, for us to know exactly what was n Peter's mind in the way of materials out of which a vision ould have been constructed, but we know that he did have he vision; and it is legitimate to infer from the vision the ature of the materials which had produced it. Moreover, we ust think of Peter as a man who lived in the environment f the first century A. D., and who would, naturally, therefore, hold the ideas about spirits which prevailed in his world t the time. The time is past when one can think of the ewish mind in the first century as isolated from the conceptions that circulated freely throughout the Hellenistic world. Ve may feel certain that Jews of the period held much the ame ideas of spirits as did their contemporaries of other eligions.[9] Whatever was true of the beliefs of peoples in eneral on this question would be true of the Jews also at he time of Jesus.

The ancient Hebrews believed in a spiritual being which nimated the body;[10] that at death it departed from the ody and joined the other departed spirits;[11] and that it was ossible for departed spirits to communicate with the living.[12] he Jews held the same ideas of demon possession and exrcism that prevailed at the time, not only in the Old Testaent period as is shown by the rigorous condemnation of

[9] Cf. Zaugg, *A Study of the Spirit-Phenomena in the NT*, 1917, . 23, "It is clear that in many ways the ancient Hebrews had the ame ideas of spirits and the same psychology as the other ancient eoples." He shows that this is true also of the later times.

[10] Gen. 2 7.

[11] Gen. 49 33 *et al.*

[12] 1 Sam. 28 13.

exorcism found there, but also in the Hellenistic period.[13] The gospels furnish evidence in abundance of exorcism and demon possession similar to that in such a treatise as *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana.*[14] But what were some of the conceptions in that ancient world about the activities of souls of the dead?

VI

In the first place, it was recognized that departed spirits did reappear and make communications to the living. The prophet Samuel was called from his grave for a conference with King Saul.[15] Herodotus wrote of the Nasamones in Libya that "their practice of divination is to go to the tombs of their ancestors, where after making prayers they lie down to sleep, and take whatever dreams come to them for oracles."[16] Origen gave both his own view and that of Plato, showing how the beliefs survived, when he wrote, "as even Plato says in his treatise on the soul that shadowy phantoms of persons already dead have appeared to some around their sepulchres. Now the phantoms which exist about the soul of the dead are produced by some substance and this substance is in the soul, which exists apart in a body said to be of splendid appearance."[17] And the popular belief in the possibility of the return of the soul is shown by Origen again when he said of Thomas, "That individual had, indeed, expressed his disbelief in the statement of the woman who said that she had seen him, not because he thought it impossible that the soul of a dead man could be seen; but he did not yet consider the report to be true that he had been raised in a body, which was the antitype of the former."[18]

[13] Tobit 8 2 ff.; Josephus, *Ant.* viii: 2, 5; cf. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N. T.*, Vol. I, pp. 2, 9, 300; Vol. II, pp. 71, 526, 760, 891; Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums etc.* (1906), pp. 381–394.

[14] Cf. iii, 56; iv, 20; v, 25; vi, 26–27.

[15] 1 Sam. 28 8–13.

[16] iv, 172.

[17] *Ad Celsum* ii, 60.

[18] *Ad Celsum* ii, 61.

n another passage Origen continues, "Seeking God, then, in his way, we have no need to visit the oracles of Trophonius, f Amphiaraus, and of Mopsus, to which Celsus would send s, assuring us that we would there 'see the gods in human orm, appearing to us with all distinctness, and without lusion.' For we know that these are demons, feeding on the lood, and smoke, and odor of victims."[19] And again, Origen estifies to the belief in appearances held by the Greeks, Now, that miraculous appearances have sometimes been witessed by human beings, is related by the Greeks . . . by those vho have given every evidence of being genuine philosophers, nd of having related with perfect truth what had happened o them."[20]

Testimony to the same phenomena is given by Tertullian, But we are met with the objection that in visions of the ight dead persons are not infrequently seen, and that for set purpose. For instance, the Nasamones consult private racles by frequent and lengthened visits to the sepulchres f their relatives, as one may find in Heraclides, or Nymphoorus, or Herodotus; and the Celts, for the same purpose, ay away all night at the tombs of their brave chieftains, as licander affirms . . . the power of God has, no doubt, somemes recalled men's souls to their bodies, as a proof of his wn transcendent rights . . ."[21]

The demons that afflicted men were often thought of as eing the spirits of the dead; to the demons in the New 'estament was attributed a roving disposition just as was the ase in Hellenistic thought in general, and when they sought y spasms for new houses and dwelling places the desire was xplained as due to their having been despoiled of their ghtful place in a human body through death.[22] Lucian has any of his characters speak of spirit appearances by day and ight and say that almost no one lives who has not seen them.[23]

[19] *ibid.* vii, 35.
[20] *ibid.* v, 57.
[21] *de anima*, 57.
[22] Baldensperger, *Urchristliche Apologie*, 1909, p. 12.
[23] *Philopseudes*, 17, 27, 30, 31; cf. Tertullian, *de anima*, 57.

He has them refer to demons, phantoms, and the souls of the dead, who flit about over the earth, of departed souls who can work on living beings just as do demons, and who can appear to the living uncalled and can become evil spirits to do living persons harm.[24] In the great magical papyrus of Wessely there is a statement about a demon which flits about.[25]

In the second place, the passages show not only that the ancient world believed in the reappearance of departed souls to living men, but that appearances were most likely to take place soon after the death of the departed. This is shown by the customs of praying and sleeping near the graves and by the ancient festivals for the dead, which were prominent especially in the old Roman religion.

VII

In the third place, souls of men who had met violent death were thought to have the habit of reappearing. Thus we have the statement of Josephus, placed in the mouth of Titus to his soldiers, "For who is there who does not know that those souls of virtuous men which are severed from their fleshly bodies in battles by the sword, are received by the ether, that purest of elements, and placed among the stars; that they may become good demons and propitious heroes, and show themselves as such to their posterity afterwards?"[26] Tertullian states, "They also say that those souls which are taken away by a premature death wander about hither and thither until they have completed the residue of the years which they would have lived through, had it not been for their untimely fate . . . Hence those souls must be accounted as passing an exile in Hades, which people are apt to regard as carried off by violence, especially by cruel tortures, such as those of the cross, and the axe, and the sword, and the

[24] *ibid.* 13, 29, 30, etc.
[25] Baldensperger, *op. cit.* 12.
[26] *Wars*, vi, 1, 5.

lion . . . In this way, . . . by magic the Aori Biaeothanati (violently slain) are actually invoked . . ."[27]

Lucian quotes a Pythagorean maxim, "A spirit only walks if its owner met with a violent end, if he was strangled, for instance, or beheaded, or crucified, and not if he died a natural death."[28] This evidence from Josephus, Tertullian and Lucian shows how prevalent these conceptions were in their day. A similar idea of the reappearance of a righteous man who had been slain by violence, even in the New Testament itself, is the suspicion attributed to Herod and to the people that John the Baptist had risen from the dead, and in the identification of Jesus with one of the prophets who would thus have risen up again from the dead.[29]

VIII

In the fourth place, men of great importance and of outstanding personality were said frequently to reappear after death. A famous example is Romulus. Florus, the Roman historian, mentions the belief on the part of some that he had been torn to pieces by the senate, but that a tempest arose and an eclipse of the Sun occurred, which indicated that an *apotheosis* had taken place; that Julius Proculus affirmed soon afterward that he had seen Romulus in a more majestic form than he had ever had; and that Romulus commanded them to accept him as divine, saying that among the gods in heaven he was called Quirinus. Thus Rome should become the mistress of the nations.[30] It was believed that the poet Aristeas returned after his death and was seen by various persons at different times during a period of years and wrote poetry during the time; and numerous Greeks and Romans claimed to have seen the risen Aesculapius.[31] Dion Cassius relates, "A spirit declaring that he was the famous

[27] *de anima* 56–57.
[28] *Philop.* 29.
[29] Matthew 14 2; 16 14.
[30] *Roman History*, I, 1; Tertullian, *Apol.* 21.
[31] Herodotus, iv, 14, 15; Origen, *ad Celsum* iii, 24–26.

Alexander of Macedon, wearing his apparel and all his apparatus, started from the regions near the Ister . . . It traveled through Thrace and Asia, revelling in company with four hundred male attendants, who were equipped with thyrsi and fawn skins, and did no harm. The fact was admitted by all those who lived in Thrace at the time that lodgings and all provisions for it were provided at public expense. And no one dared to oppose it, either by word or by deed—no governor, no soldier, no procurator, no heads of provinces—but proceeding as if in a daylight procession prescribed by proclamation, to the confines of Bithynia. Leaving that point, it approached the Chalcedonian land, and there, after performing some sacred rite by night, and burying a wooden horse, it vanished."[32]

Now thus far, in regard to the vision material that was available for Peter's mind, (although it is not assumed that he knew all the instances cited here, but rather that the ideas behind such stories were general property), the belief has been shown that men possessed souls which left their bodies at death and lived on; that these souls reappeared to the living at times; that they were especially likely to reappear soon after death, often near the graves, though not by any means always there; especially, that innocent men who had been violently slain were accustomed to return; and, more especially still, that the souls of great personalities, such as poets, generals, statesmen, great physicians and healers, great teachers and prophets, were believed to return.

IX

To this material, which was certainly available for Peter, must be added a consideration of the personality of Jesus and what the disciples thought of him. It is evident to the most casual student of the gospels and of early Christianity that Jesus was, to say the least, a great Jewish teacher. The liberal Jews of our own day are glad to admit this. He

[32] Dion Cassius, lxxix, 18.

drew about himself some very intimate friends with whom he lived in the closest companionship. He was a miracle worker, exorcist and healer, and was conscious of the endowment of the spirit of God. His temperament was ecstatic and apocalyptic. He was concerned with the religious attitudes and relationships of life; and he saw the spiritual values rather than the ceremonial in the religious practices which he advocated and the law prescribed. It is well recognized that he was a preacher of repentance; that the old order was at an end and that the kingdom of God was ready to be ushered in by the appearance of the Messiah on the clouds of heaven. That much at least is certain. What he taught about himself is difficult to know, since it is next to impossible to distinguish between his own teaching about himself and what his disciples thought about him later on and projected back into his own teaching. It is not desirable here to present the problem in detail, since too much space would be required.[33] But it may be pointed out that the statements of the gospels that he claimed to be the Messiah have great difficulties, since it could scarcely be maintained that he claimed to be a Davidic Messiah and would deliver his nation by the sword; and it is difficult to see how he could have thought of himself as an apocalyptic Messiah, since in all the conceptions of that rôle found in Jewish literature, from which Jesus naturally would have taken the pattern for his own thinking on the question, there was no program outlined which allowed for a previous life in the flesh on earth before the revelation of the Messiah on the clouds from heaven. Nor is there any evidence of a conception which made room for the cross before the revelation from heaven. So it is difficult to see how Jesus could have conceived of himself in this rôle.

And it is just as difficult to conceive of Jesus predicting his death and resurrection on the third day or after three

[33] Cf. the question in Case, *Jesus, a New Biography*, (1927), pp. 326–387. Also, in E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, (1911), pp. 209-244.

days and nights, or that he predicted his resurrection at all. It is quite conceivable, however, that he did forsee his death when he was near the end. But even if Jesus did predict his death and resurrection on the third day, it is evident that the disciples did not understand it, from the apologetic statements of the evangelists, who always explain that when the predictions were made the disciples did not understand, and that Jesus charged them not to tell anyone. This is clearly evidence that the evangelists felt obliged to explain to the readers of their books why no one knew of the predictions until after the event. And to accept the predictions as authentic would make the whole experience of the disciples at the cross a mere farce. If the disciples expected Jesus to rise on the third day, why were they so terrified by the tragedy? And why did they give up their hopes? And, again, assuming the prophecies genuine, how did Jesus foresee that his resurrection would take place on the third day? Or that the first vision experience would happen on that day? The alternative is to explain the predictions as the work of the disciples in their reflection upon the events after they had passed by; and to assign them to that period when they began to search the scriptures to give validity to their religious experiences.[34]

On the other hand, that the movement with which Jesus was identified was messianic is certain. This was true also of the movement begun by John the Baptist. They were both preaching about the messianic kingdom which was just at the door, and were urging the people to get themselves ready for it by repentance. Some thought that John was the Messiah. It is likely that Herod put him to death because of rumors to this effect. And Jesus had begun his work in connection with John. It is clear that the personality and preaching and work of Jesus caused many to wonder whether he might not be the Messiah. Some thought from the nature of his work and preaching that he was a re-embodiment of

[34] It is impossible here to enter into the problems of the three days motive and of the origin of the observance of Sunday as the resurrection day.

Elijah, or Elisha, for it was expected that Elijah would return before the day of the kingdom and the Messiah.[35] Others thought even that he was John the Baptist who had come to life.[36] And it seems to be certain that at times the disciples believed that he was the Messiah. His word attracted such attention that the Roman authorities crucified him on the charge that he was king of the Jews. No doubt they saw that a strong messianic movement had developed or was developing, or they would not have executed Jesus. It is certain that the disciples were familiar with the popular thinking about Jesus as Messiah, and they knew the charge upon which he was put to death. So whether Jesus made messianic claims for himself or not, these thoughts are another element of the influence of the personality of Jesus which entered into the materials in the mind of Peter out of which his vision was made.

In the mind of Peter, then, there was the belief that man has a soul which leaves his body at death, that souls often return after death, that this is true especially in the cases of innocent men violently slain, and in particular was this the case with great personages, in Judea, such as Elijah and Elisha and John the Baptist; there was in his mind the fact that in the case of Jesus all of these conditions were fulfilled; there was also the belief on the part of many that Jesus was the Messiah and his execution on that charge; and, finally, in the mind of Peter was the memory of all the personal associations which he had enjoyed with Jesus, the tragedy of the cross and the emptiness in his life, from which his beloved master had been violently torn away.

X

It is in place here to observe that many visions have a very definite functional value. There are, of course, visions which derange the personality and drive the seer into ab-

[35] Matthew 16 16.
[36] Matthew 14 2; 16 16.

normal states, which produce delirium and insanity; there are those, moreover, which arise out of a pathological consciousness and continue the process of psychic disorganization; but there are others which have a healing and restorative function for the person who has been disorganized and torn from his moorings and lead the seer out of the derangement back to the calm and poise of a wholesome psychic life. Such a vision always supplies a need; it renders the help which is needed and at the time when it is needed.[37] All of the citations given above are evidence of this very fact. When Paul reached the limits of Asia a vision led him on to Europe.[38] When the relatives of the dead worshiped at the graves they got their communications. When the disciple of Apollonius of Tyana was meditating about his departed master a remarkable vision occurred in which the master returned to him.[39] The vision is always a product of a particular situation which has caused the need for it to arise, and not vice versa. The visions which came to the patients in the temples of Aesculapius brought instructions for the cure of the disease.[40] And they often assumed very elaborate forms in which the sick would see the divine messengers who came to perform the act of healing.[41]

[37] Stafford, *The Function of Divine Manifestations in NT Times*, (1919), p. 109.

[38] Acts 16 9.

[39] *Life*, 8, 31.

[40] Cf. *CIG*, no. 5980, 15 ff., of 138 A. D. "To Valerius Aper, a blind soldier, the god revealed that he should go and take blood of a white cock, together with honey, and rub them into an eye-salve and anoint his eyes three days. And he received his sight, and came and gave thanks publicly to the god."

[41] Cf. Grenfell and Hunt, *Ox. Pap.* xi, pp. 230 ff., 2nd century A. D. "When I, too, afterwards was suddenly seized by pain in my right side, I quickly hastened to the helper of the human race, and he being again disposed to pity listened to me, and displayed still more effectively his peculiar clemency which as I am intending to mount his terrible powers I will substantiate – It was night when every living creature was asleep except those in pain, but divinity showed itself more effectively. A violent fever burned me, and I was convulsed with loss of breath and coughing, owing to the pain proceeding from my side.

When Peter returned to Galilee what was the greatest need of his life? What was the greatest yearning of his soul? Was it not some message that would lift him out of the gloom that had fallen over his spirit from the shadow of the cross? Would not a message from his master out of the realm of the dead supply this need? It must have been in such a mood that Peter went back to the familiar scenes where he had been with Jesus—far away from the distractions of the feast and of the mob that had slain his Lord, where he had been too dazed to realize fully just what had happened—to his home by the sea.[42]

Heavy in the head with my troubles, I was lapsing half-conscious into sleep and my mother, as a mother would for her child (and she is by nature very affectionate) being extremely grieved at my agonies, was sitting without enjoying even a brief period of slumber, when suddenly she perceived—it was not dream or sleep, for her eyes were open immovably, though not seeing clearly for a divine and terrifying vision came to her, easily preventing her from observing the god himself or his servants, whichever it was. In any case there was some one whose height was more than human clothed in shining raiment and carrying in his left hand a book, who after merely regarding me two or three times from head to foot disappeared. When she had recovered herself she tried still trembling to wake me, and, finding that the fever had left me and that much sweat was pouring off me, did reverence to the manifestation of the god, and wiped me and made me more collected. When I spoke with her she wished to declare the virtue of the god, but I, anticipating her, told her all myself; for everything that she saw in visions appeared to me also in dreams. After these pains in my side had ceased and the god had given me another assuaging cure I proclaimed his benefits . . ." For a very instructive discussion of healings in the Hellenistic world, cf. S. J. Case, *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. iii, No. 3, May, 1923.

[42] With all of the materials in hand, however, out of which the vision arose, in spite of our desire to penetrate the last element of mystery that surrounds that radical experience out of which the Christian church has arisen, the *emergence* of the vision itself eludes the grasp of the analytical processes of our empirical method. The vision cannot be explained completely at the present status of scientific investigation in these fields. It is not enough just to have pointed out the available material—in the way of certain beliefs, ecstatic personalities and situations involving unusual emotional strain—out of which a vision might have arisen. We know only that when these factors are present visions often

And when Peter cast his nets into the sea once more, he heard the voice of Jesus calling him from the shore; just as he had done in days gone by, he recognized the familiar form there again through the mists of dawn; his heart glowed within him as there came to him the certainty that his Master was not dead, but alive again, and that he had heard him speak as of old.[43] This time it was a message to gather together again the little flock that had been scattered by the persecution incident to the crucifixion of Jesus at the feast in Jerusalem.

The experience was as objective and real to Peter as was the appearance of Apollonius to the young man who had waited so long for a word from the life beyond to assure him that his master was yet alive; it was as real as the visions which came to those who lay upon their beds of affliction in the temples of Aesculapius and brought their

occur. The vision was in itself a new phenomenon of the emotional life and was not merely a mechanical combination of those various elements, which our analysis has shown to have been at hand. The empirical method at the present time is really unable to do more than to present a descriptive analysis and cannot yet reach the final goal of complete explanation. It is not necessary to resort to the supernatural; such a procedure would not help matters in the least. Any explanation must keep within the limits of the laws of psychic phenomena that have been explored. The present attempt has been kept within the limits of a monistic world-view and of the empirical method. But after the scientific method has reached its limit there still remain questions that have not been answered—that is true whether the problem of investigation be in the field of material or psychic phenomena—and the veil of mystery is not completely lifted. That is not to place the vision of Peter in a class by itself; for it is true of the most familiar objects all about us. The philosopher has not yet given a complete definition of reality; matter has not been completely explored by the processes of the physical laboratory; the psychologist has not yet solved the riddle of consciousness; nor has the biologist been able entirely to comprehend the mutations through which life moves forward.

[43] Mark's narrative of Jesus' walking on the sea in the fourth watch of the night (6 45–52) may be a survival of the first, or of a subsequent, vision of the risen Jesus, that has been projected backward into his lifetime. It points also to Galilee as the place where the visions occurred, and possibly to the fishermen at their nets.

messages of healing; and it was just as real to Peter as the visions of the Master's face and person which he had been used to seeing during the lifetime of Jesus. The distinction between a vision that is produced by the reaction of the physical eyes to rays of light reflected from external objects and one that is entirely the product of subjective processes, which produce a visual hallucination, does not exist for the seer. They are both equally real to him. Peter saw Jesus just as he was used to seeing him in the past. The vision was completely satisfying. It was the response to every craving of his soul. Coming as a true expression of his entire emotional life it was full and adequate; every feature of the need in Peter's soul found its counterpart in the vision which he saw. It was the functional value which gave the vision its complete validity. It gave the satisfaction needed. That it gave Peter a new grip on life and filled him with such faith that he revived the faith of his brethren, is a fact of history. That we can partly analyse the experience by no means impairs its function or detracts from its reality or its value. The experience was of such a quality that Peter became the one who had the right to stand at the gate of the kingdom of heaven with its keys in his hands; and to him was given the power to bind and loose as he was directed by the spirit of Jesus. This position of honor and power in the early church is most certain evidence of the fact that *ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι* (Luke 24 34).

THE ASCENSION STORY

MORTON S. ENSLIN
CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PERHAPS the most interesting and important detail of the ascension story with which the book of Acts opens is the statement that it took place forty days after the resurrection. It is well known that the only mention of the ascension in the New Testament is in Luke-Acts, and perhaps only in Acts, save for the phrase, ἀνελήμφθη ἐν δόξῃ, in the fragment of the early Christian hymn in 1 Tim. 3 16, a passage almost certainly dependent on the Acts account. Granted the belief which was apparently held by the early followers of Jesus, at least from the time of their restored hopes, that he was in heaven and would speedily come again, it would perhaps be only a question of time when some daring and imaginative follower would seek to visualize the snatching up to heaven. And with the stories of the translation of Elijah, and of Isaiah, of Enoch, and of Moses at hand there need be little wonder at the emergence of a Christian parallel.[1] The noteworthy thing is not the mechanics of the miracle. The representation is natural enough for the thought world of the first century. Heaven was above; if Jesus were to reach it, he would have to ascend. The noteworthy thing is that this parting is here represented as taking place forty days after the escape from the tomb, instead of

[1] The notice to the effect that the disciples beheld him as he was taken up ("And when he had said these things, as they were looking, he was taken up . . . and while they were looking steadfastly into heaven as he went," Acts 1 9, 10) may perhaps be reminiscent of the condition laid upon Elisha by Elijah . . . "if thou see me when I am taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but if not, it shall not be so . . . And Elisha saw it, and he cried . . ." (2 Kings 2 10 ff.).

being a part of the resurrection, as is certainly the case for Paul and Matthew, and perhaps even for John.

Indeed it is held to be highly probable by some scholars that that is the representation of the gospel of Luke. Were it not for Acts 1 probably no one would question that the separation of Luke 24 51 is represented as taking place on the evening of the resurrection day. The objections raised on the basis of the distance of Emmaus and of the necessity of a parting at night need not be considered. The author is recounting a series of marvels; why a night parting should have been undesirable I do not know. Certainly verses 36–53 run smoothly and without apparent lapse of time.

It is unnecessary here to discuss the problem of the text of Luke 24 51. The probability that the words, *καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*, are a non-Western interpolation, and accordingly a later addition to the text, has commended itself to most critics. Luke 9 51, rendered by the ARV: "And it came to pass, when the days were well nigh come that he should be received up," etc. (*ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ*) is most obscure. *ἀναλήμψεως* apparently refers to the coming ascension, not to his acceptance among men (Wieseler and Lange) or to his passion (Klostermann). There is apparently no problem of text here. Whether the choice of this word—apparently regularly but not exclusively used to refer to the "Assumption of the Blessed"—implies the story of Acts 1 is not clear; that it implies an interval of forty days before the *ἀνάλημψις* is of course not the case.

The possibility that the account in the closing chapter of the gospel is intentionally foreshortened is of course not to be overlooked, although the current explanations that this was due to the author coming to the end of his roll prematurely or that this parting is not a final parting may safely be disregarded. And yet on the whole it does not seem a violence to feel that in the interim between volumes I and II the author has gained information of a kind that causes him to correct his chronology.[2]

[2] It need not be objected that this makes a modern and artificial severance between the two parts of a closely connected writing. Unless

Those who have accepted this position have usually stressed the fact that ἀνελήμφθη (Acts 1 2) implies that in the earlier part of the work the author had carried the story down to the final parting; and that accordingly it was illegitimate to argue that the Western text of Luke 24 51 implied an "earlier" parting.

In the *Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. III, pp. 256–261, Professor Ropes has urged the excision of ἀνελήμφθη on grounds that seem to me probable, as being "due to the innocent desire of a very early editor to introduce here a mention of the Ascension." He continues, "Without an express statement of the Ascension in Luke 24 51 the reference of Acts 1 2 is positively unsuitable, and in any case the natural place for any mention of it in Acts is not reached until verse 9, where the full account of the event is given as an integral part of the narrative reserved for the present 'treatise'."

This change of text would not affect the possibility of the ascension story and of the forty days being new material obtained since the completion of volume I. He receives them or evolves them and quietly inserts them at the beginning of the second part. He does not raise the question of literary dishonesty by pretending that he had described the ascension, as might have been the case if he had used ἀνελήμφθη in verse 2 as a tacit interpretation of the concluding incident of volume I. Rather he resumes the story and works in this new material.

In an article in the Expositor for March 1909, pp. 254–261, *The Ascension in Luke and Acts*, Professor Bacon has argued that the apparent contradiction between the two accounts vanishes if Acts 1 3 be regarded as "interjected parenthetically, simply to inform the reader that the main manifestations already

the recent suggestion of Professor Lake be accepted that the two were written as one work, and that their separation was due to a later hand, who framed a conclusion for the former and an introduction for the latter (which is interesting but unsupported by evidence), Acts 1 1 intimates that there actually was a division. Is it not quite as artificial to think that in the course of the composition of so extended a piece of writing as Luke-Acts no new evidence appeared, but at the moment of penning the opening words of the gospel all the material had been compiled and tabulated?

related were not the only ones, but that the appearances to the disciples continued for 'forty days'." This verse, he maintains, interrupts the context, for Acts 1 4 refers to Luke 24 48–49, while Acts 1 6–11 clearly continues the preceding paragraph. Accordingly, "Luke" conceived the ascension *at the beginning*, not at the end, of the appearances to the disciples, and did not depart from *all* the testimony available from the apostolic and post-apostolic age.

Though this suggestion is not lightly to be rejected and is worthy of more consideration than has been granted it, several objections seem to me to argue decisively against it. First, it must be frankly admitted with Professor Bacon that Acts 1 3 does seem to be an interjected parenthesis to the effect that appearances were granted the apostles. Nothing is implied about their time or nature. But in the next verse it is said, *καὶ συναλιζόμενος παρήγγειλεν . . .* *συναλιζόμενος* has long been a *crux interpretum*, as a recent writer aptly remarks. Attempts to derive it from *συναλίζω* in the sense of "eat with" or from *συναλίζομαι* in the sense of "gather" (transitive or intransitive) have always met with difficulties which need not be repeated here. Recently Professor Cadbury has proposed a way out of the dilemma of these alternatives.[3] He suggests that *συναλιζόμενος* is to be derived from *αὐλίζομαι*, and is an alternative spelling for *συναυλιζόμενος*. He then translates it "living with," in the sense of spending the night together in the open. The evidence he cites appears to me to make this interpretation highly probable. If this view be accepted, it would seem to exclude definitely the suggestion that Luke understood the appearances to be of the ascended Lord, for verse 4 would then be seen to continue verse 3. Jesus not only appeared to the apostles by the space of forty days, but lived with them during the period. The appearances could then hardly be understood as those given in the gospel, and Professor Bacon's strongest argument, that these verses resume the concluding words of the gospel, will not stand. If, as seems probable, *ἀνελήμφθη* is to be excised from verse 2, the whole section is seen to be an orderly statement

[3] Journal of Biblical Literature, XLV (1926), pp. 310 ff.

that after the resurrection Jesus stayed with the disciples for a period of forty days, and then was taken from them.

Furthermore, it is to be noted that Professor Bacon's statement that "*all* the testimony available from the apostolic and post-apostolic age" was to the effect "that the ascension was conceived to have occurred *at the beginning*, not at the end, of the appearances to the disciples" is not consonant with the evidence, as we shall see below.

The origin of the forty day interval, which was so contrary to the earlier tradition and which because of this seems to have been disregarded for many years, is an interesting question. Acts 13 31 makes Paul say of Jesus in his speech at Pisidian Antioch that "God raised him from the dead, and he was seen for many days of them that came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem." May we have here a possible clew as to what started "Luke" in this new line? He becomes acquainted with a tradition, perhaps somewhat akin to that of Paul's in 1 Cor., that Jesus had appeared for many days. This he takes over, and understands "the appearances" of Jesus had been in a resuscitated body. At the conclusion of the period of "many days" he visualizes him in his assumption to heaven, for which models, as suggested above, would not be wanting.

Are there any clews to the choice of the number forty? Two points may perhaps be noted. Pentecost apparently is the *terminus ad quem*. For the author that was the time when the prophecy of the pouring out of the spirit had been realized. Unlike the author of the Fourth Gospel, who makes Jesus breathe upon his disciples on the resurrection evening, the author of Acts has Jesus send his spirit from heaven. It had been hinted at in the gospel (24 49), "tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high." The Pentecost incident is apparently in his mind as he wrote these words. Is it not conceivable that after finishing the first volume his attention is caught by some such simple statement as he preserves in Acts 13 31, that as a matter of fact Jesus had appeared over a period of days? This gives him a reason for the command to wait in Jerusalem. It is in order that the series of appearances or visits with the Lord may not be interrupted. But

Pentecost stands as the fixed date for their close. Jesus had sent his spirit from heaven. Accordingly the departure must have been prior. If it were desired to be a little more explicit than "many days," forty could hardly be surpassed. It had come to be a round number probably because of its being the approximate length of a generation. The flood had lasted forty days and forty nights; Moses had been in the mountain forty days and forty nights, while Elijah too had fasted for that period. Ezra is directed to tell the people not to seek him for forty days. This he does, and then spends the time in dictating to his five companions the scriptures which had perished in the destruction of Jerusalem. "And then was Ezra caught away, and taken up into the place of such as were like him, after having written all these things" (4 Ezra 14 23–49). Similarly Baruch is directed to give instructions to the people for forty days after which he will "depart from this earth, nevertheless not unto death, but shall be preserved unto the consummation of the times" (2 Baruch 76 1–4). While the date of these two apocalypses probably precludes their use by the author of the story in Acts, it is equally improbable that they were influenced by the Acts account. The forty years of wandering in the wilderness, corresponding to the forty days in which the spies had spied out the land; the forty years of subjection to the Philistines; the occasional forty years of rest that came upon Israel as the result of the exploits of Othniel and Gideon; the fact that many of the worthies, notably David, Solomon, Joash, Eli, ruled or judged forty years; that many of them started their rule at that age; that Ezekiel was bidden to lie on his right side forty days, each day for a year; or that Goliath challenged Israel for forty days; — all these, and they are not exhaustive, show the prominence this number had in Hebrew and Jewish thought. There is accordingly a very fair chance that the fixed date of Pentecost (i. e. fifty days after the Passion), in addition to the extreme appropriateness of the number forty —already used of an earlier exploit of Jesus[4] — contributed to the church calendar.

[4] Luke 4 2.

In an article *Die Tessarakontaden und Tessarakontadenlehren der Griechen und anderen Völker* (Berichte d. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1909, pp. 21–206), W. H. Roscher has collected and partially analyzed a vast quantity of cases where the number forty occurred among non-Semitic peoples. He also refers to and gives an index of an earlier article in which the same task was performed for the Semites. I have not been able to discover this earlier section.

It is perhaps worth suggesting that the occurrence of a forty days' *Trauerfrist* among many non-Semitic peoples makes us wonder if after all there is some more subtle reason for the choice of forty than the connexion with Pentecost, and that we have here a trace of a view that, due to the contamination of death, a period of ceremonial defilement resulted making an advent into the presence of God during such a time unthinkable. It is of course to be noted that the period of public mourning even for the greatest Jewish men was but thirty days. Roscher remarks there may be „eine Spur davon"—i. e. of a forty day mourning fast—in Jewish teaching as there surely is among the Mandaeans, Arabs, and other Mohammedan tribes (*op. cit.* p. 23), and refers to the Midrash, *Beresch. R.* on Gen. 50 4, but this is almost surely not the case. In the *Vitae Adae et Evae* Adam decides to stand in the river Jordan in water up to his neck for forty days because of the uncleanness resulting from the sin in the garden, and Eve stands similarly for thirty-seven days in the Tigris (VI, VII).

But the absence of any real evidence of a forty day defilement from death makes any such guess precarious. It will probably be wise to hold it in abeyance as a bare possibility[5], and to see the forty days as the natural expression of a period between the resurrection and the Pentecost experiences.

That Paul is unacquainted with the story of an ascension is hardly open to debate. That as a result of death Christ had

[5] It may be noted in passing that from the ninth hour of the crucifixion Friday (Lu. 23 44; cf. Mk. 15 33) to "the first day of the week at early dawn" (Lu. 24 1) is just forty hours. I commend this to those more skilled and interested than myself in the highly diverting game of sacred arithmetic.

been highly exalted and had taken his seat at the right hand of God is a fundamental point.[6] The resurrection was the way. Nor do the appearances in 1 Cor. 15 1–11 demand a post-resurrection-ante-ascension activity. The point of moment for Paul was that his experience with the risen Lord was just as real as were those of the other apostles. This he is at pains to stress in Galatians. Accordingly in his catalog of appearances in 1 Cor. 15 the significant point is that they are all of exactly the same type. The appearance to him can hardly have been else in his thinking than an appearance from heaven of the exalted Christ; similarly then those to Cephas, to the twelve, to the five hundred, to James, and to all the apostles.

What Mark's conception was is of course not clear. As the gospel stands now there are no appearances.[7] If the ending has been removed, there may have been appearances in Galilee, perhaps indicated by the words, "he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him, as he said unto you" (Mk. 16 7). *προάγει* is surely not to be understood in the sense, "he conducts or walks with you," but "he precedes you. It is in Galilee ye shall see him." It in no wise implies that the appearances will be other than from heaven.

Similarly in the case of Matthew. It seems reasonably clear that the Jesus who meets the disciples in Galilee with the words, "All authority hath been given unto me *in heaven* and on earth" (28 18), is the ascended Jesus who having come from heaven may thus appropriately speak. Probably the earlier appearance to the women (28 9–10) would not have suggested a meeting

[6] Phil. 2 8 ff.; Ro. 8 34; Col. 3 1 ff., *et pass.* Passages such as 1 Thes. 4 16 and 2 Thes. 1 7 do not seem to me to justify the contention of Swete (*The Apostles' Creed*, 2nd ed., 1894, p. 67) that the hope of a *κατάβασις* postulates an antecedent *ἀνάβασις*, which is distinct from the resurrection. That Jesus was in heaven was of course Paul's belief, but that his ascension had been as described in Acts 1 is certainly not implied. 1 Pet. 3 22 (*ὅς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν*) and Hebr. 4 14 (*ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς*) are probably to be understood in the same way.

[7] The appearances and the ascension in the later ending (16 9–20) have no independent value, but simply reflect the three other gospels and the book of Acts.

before Jesus had rejoined the Father except on the basis of the Acts account.

In the case of the Fourth Gospel it is not so clear. The word with which Jesus deters Mary, "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended (ἀναβέβηκα) unto the Father; but go unto my brethren, and say to them, I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God" (20 17), implies an interval between the resurrection and the ascension, but does not imply knowledge of the ascension story of Acts or of a forty day interval. At the next meeting which took place on the same evening Jesus breathes on them and says, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit" (20 22). Earlier in the gospel (7 39) it is said, "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive; for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified." Apparently this glorification was the reception into heavenly glory which the author would thus maintain had already taken place.[8] On the following first day of the week the invitation to Thomas to touch him, which had previously been denied "for I am not yet ascended unto the Father," would imply that in the interim the ἀνάβασις had taken place. It is perhaps not clear whether the author of the Fourth Gospel is acquainted with the Acts account; it is certain that if he were he did not accept it. Apparently the rejoining the Father was on the same day as the emergence from the tomb, certainly not more than a week later.

Nor did the Acts story fare better in the early church. In the Epistle of Barnabas (15 9) the statement is explicit: διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανούς. It would seem as if he meant by the eighth day the resurrection Sunday (i. e. the day after the Sabbath, the seventh day). If this be rejected, it could only be some other Sunday; forty days after the resurrection surely would fall on Thursday, not Sunday.[9]

[8] Yet cf. John 13 31.

[9] Swete (*op. cit*, p. 69) maintains that although Barnabas "seems to affirm that both the Resurrection and the Ascension occurred on the eighth day, or on a Sunday," he does not necessarily conflict with the account in Acts. "Undoubtedly it was a natural inference from

The silence of Clement of Rome, Ignatius,[10] Polycarp, Hermas, and the Didache regarding any ascension, while of course not conclusive, is tolerably strong evidence that they were unacquainted with, or rejected, any tradition separating it from the resurrection.

In the case of Justin Martyr the situation is different. The ordinary statement that he "continues to regard both events [i. e. resurrection and ascension] as two parts of one act,"[11] runs counter to the evidence. It may be well to quote the evidence in full:

St. Luke's words that the Ascension took place on the fortieth day after the Resurrection; and this inference is already drawn by the author of the fifth book of the *Constitutions* (*Const. Ap.* V, 19 *ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης κυριακῆς ἀριθμήσαντες τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας, ἀπὸ κυριακῆς ἄχρι πέμπτης ἑορτάζετε τὴν ἑορτὴν τῆς ἀναλήψεως*), and since the fourth century has been sanctioned by the annual celebration of Holy Thursday. Yet the words of the Acts allow greater latitude, and would be satisfied if the Ascension could be shewn to have taken place on the following Sunday, the forty-third day after Easter. Indeed the Syriac *Doctrine of the Apostles* carries it forward to the fiftieth day, making it coincide with the Descent of the Holy Ghost (Cureton, *Ancient documents*, pp. 24, 27). This is clearly inconsistent with the Acts, but it supports the statement of Barnabas that the Ascension occurred on the first day of the week."

[10] In the "long" recension the following accounts are given, Trall. 9: "He also rose again in three days, the Father raising him up; and after spending forty days with the apostles, he was received up to the Father, and 'sat down at his right hand, expecting till his enemies are placed under his feet;'" Smyrn. 3: "Nor was this all; but also after he had shown himself to them, that he had risen indeed, and not in appearance only, he both ate and drank with them during forty entire days. And thus was he, with the flesh, received up in their sight unto him that sent him, being with that same flesh to come again, accompanied by glory and power. For, say the [holy] oracles, 'This same Jesus, who is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come, in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.'"

The words, "Hasten all to come together as to one temple of God, as to one altar, to one Jesus Christ, who came forth from the one Father, and is with one, *and departed to one*" (Magn. 7, 2) implies nothing as to how this departure was conceived.

[11] P. W. Schmiedel, art. "Resurrection—and Ascension—Narratives," *Enc. Bibl.*, p 4061.

1 Ap. 46 5: *Ἰησοῦς . . . καὶ σταυρωθεὶς καὶ ἀποθανὼν ἀνέστη καὶ ἀνελήλυθεν εἰς οὐρανόν . . .*

ibid. 51 6: *ὡς δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔμελλεν ἀνιέναι, καθὼς προεφητεύθη, ἀκούσατε.* Then follows the familiar quotation from Ps. 23 (24) 7, 8.

Tryph. 32 3: *ὅπερ γίνεται ἐξότου εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνελήφθη μετὰ τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι ὁ ἡμέτερος κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός . . .*

ibid. 36 5 [In answer to the query of Ps. 23 (24) 8 *τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης; κ. τ. λ.*]: *κύριος οὖν τῶν δυνάμεων ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Σολομὼν ἀποδέδεικται· ἀλλὰ ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς ὅτε ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη καὶ ἀνέβαινεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, κελεύονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ταχθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄρχοντες ἀνοῖξαι τὰς πύλας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἵνα εἰσέλθῃ οὗτος ὅς ἐστι βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης, καὶ ἀναβὰς καθίσῃ ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρός . . .*

ibid. 38 1: *εἶτα ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ αναβεβηκέναι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν . . .*

ibid. 108 2 . . . *λέγοντες ἐξηγέρθαι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνεληλυθέναι . . .* [the early charge that the disciples had stolen the body and had claimed that Jesus had risen]. To these passages perhaps should be added 1 Ap. 54 6–8, in which Justin asserts that the legends of the assumption of Dionysus and Bellerophon and Perseus are the creations of the evil demons who through their failure to interpret aright the prophecies of Jesus' ascension made clumsy imitations of this event to discredit it.

But while these passages are such as to seem to bear out the usual statements about Justin's identification of the two events, this is not the case for 1 Ap. 50 12: *μετὰ οὖν τὸ σταυρωθῆναι αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ γνώριμοι αὐτοῦ πάντες ἀπέστησαν, ἀρνησάμενοι αὐτόν· ὕστερον δέ, ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντος καὶ ὀφθέντος αὐτοῖς καὶ ταῖς προφητείαις ἐντυχεῖν, ἐν αἷς πάντα ταῦτα προείρητο γενησόμενα, διδάξαντος, καὶ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνερχόμενον ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες καὶ δύναμιν ἐκεῖθεν αὐτοῖς πεμφθεῖσαν παρ' αὐτοῦ λαβόντες καὶ εἰς πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων ἐλθόντες ταῦτα ἐδίδαξαν καὶ ἀπόστολοι προσηγορεύθησαν.* Here the text is explicit.[12]

[12] With this may be compared the passage in *περὶ ἀναστάσεως*, chap. 9: "And when he had thus shown them that there is truly a resurrection

καὶ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀνερχόμενον ἰδόντες can mean nothing else than that they saw him ascending into heaven. Apparently then this precludes the assumption that he regarded the resurrection and the ascension as "two parts of the same act." While the other passages are in themselves indeterminate upon this point, they by no means demand identification but may be interpreted as this last passage must be. However, it is to be observed that there is no indication of the length of time between the resurrection and the ascension and that the former entails the latter.

The one reference to the passion in the Apology of Aristides (chap. 15: *μετὰ δὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀνεβίω καὶ εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνῆλθεν*) gives no clew as to the conception of the author upon the point at issue.

The statement that Irenaeus too considered the resurrection and ascension parts of the same event must not be understood in the sense of an ascension from the grave. He explicitly states: "[It is certain], too, from the fact that the Lord rose from the dead on the third day, and manifested himself to his disciples, and was in their sight received up into heaven . . ." (II, 32 3 Mass.). His other references (I, 10 1 and III, 4 2) throw no light on the problem.

In his writing *Adv. Judaeos* (cap. XIII, Migne 2, 636 D) Tertullian's words, *cum utique post resurrectionem eius a mortuis, quae die tertia effecta est, coeli eum receperunt secundum prophetiam,* can hardly yield a sense other than that the heavens received him on the day of his resurrection. In his *Apologeticus adv. Gentes* (cap. XXI, Migne 1, 402 A), on the contrary, he

of the flesh, wishing to show them this also, that it is not impossible for flesh to ascend into heaven (as he had said that our dwelling place is in heaven) 'he was taken up into heaven while they beheld,' as he was in the flesh."

Whether this treatise is to be ascribed to Justin or not is very difficult to decide. Both Harnack (*Die Chronologie d. altchristl. Lit. bis Euseb.* I, pp. 508 ff.) and Krüger (*Altchristl. Lit.*, p. 69) express themselves with caution on this point. At any rate it can hardly be dated later than 180 (so Harnack), and accordingly, if not from the pen of Justin, bears witness that another writer in the second century differentiated the *ἀνάστασις* and *ἀνάληψις*.

follows the Acts account: *Cum discipulis autem quibusdam apud Galilaeam Judaeae regionem ad quadraginta dies egit, docens eos quae docerent. Dehinc ordinatio eis ad officium praedicandi per orbem, circumfusa nube in coelum est ereptus multo verius quam apud vos asseverare de Romulo Proculi solent.* Though the tradition of the forty days is followed here, it may be observed in passing that the Luke-Acts representation of appearances restricted to Jerusalem is disregarded in favor of those in Galilee.

Brief mention should be made of another ancient writing which has a direct statement of the ascension. In the Gospel of Peter the angel says to the seeking women, "Wherefore are ye come? whom seek ye? him who was crucified? he is risen and gone (*ἀνέστη καὶ ἀπῆλθεν*). But if ye believe not, stoop down and look in and see the place where he lay that he is not here; for he is risen and gone thither from whence he was sent (*ἀνέστη γὰρ καὶ ἀπῆλθεν ἐκεῖ ὅθεν ἀπεστάλη*) (cap. 13)." The *ἀπῆλθεν* may look back to the exit from the tomb, but more probably to the crucifixion where it is said: *καὶ ὁ κύριος ἀνεβόησε λέγων ἡ δύναμίς μου, ἡ δύναμις, κατέλειψάς με. καὶ εἰπὼν ἀνελήφθη* (cap. 5). Here the ascension is connected with the moment of death. Swete (*The Akhmîm Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter*, p. 10) argues that Origen apparently accepted this view.[13]

The evidence thus suggests that the story of the forty days intercourse of the Lord with his disciples on earth and of a final translation to glory is a late and not widely diffused tradition that either came to our author after the completion of volume I, or was produced by him on the basis of some such statement in his sources as he has preserved in Acts 13 31. That it was not accepted by the early Christians in spite of the fact that it was sponsored by a writer later to be reckoned as a producer of scripture is also clear. Aside from occasional gnostics who taught a post-resurrection period of eighteen

[13] For a discussion of the relation of the ascension from the cross to the later account of the resurrection, see Lake, "*The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*," pp. 155 ff.

months, or in the case of the *Pistis Sophia* twelve years, in order to provide opportunity for the risen Lord to communicate his esoteric teaching,[14] the commonly held view seems to have been that the resurrection in itself entailed the translation to glory.[15] But as the years went by and the Christian writings became scripture, the need of harmony prevailed. Since the statement in Acts was explicit and could hardly be explained otherwise than as it read, and since scripture could not contradict scripture, the tendency seems to have been to take the Acts statement as the standard and to force the other views into its mold. Harmony has usually been purchased at the expense of historical accuracy.

[14] Iren., I, 3 2; 30 14 says that the Valentinians and the Ophites taught that Jesus remained on earth eighteen months. A similar note is found in the present Ethiopic text of the Ascension of Isaiah 9 16: "He will ascend on the third day, [and he will remain in the world 545 days]." According to Charles (*The Ascension of Isaiah*, 1900, p. 63) the bracketed words are to be seen as a gnostic interpolation. In the *Pistis Sophia* (I, 1) it is said: "It came to pass, when Jesus had risen from the dead, that he passed eleven years discoursing with his disciples, etc." The wisdom contained in the book is communicated in the twelfth year.

To these may be added the remark by Eusebius that, as Jesus' ministry was the week prophesied by Daniel 9 27, in the midst of which sacrifice and oblation ceased, it extended over a period of seven years bisected by the passion: *εἴη ἂν οὖν ἑβδομὰς ἐτῶν μία ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ συνδιατριβῆς, ὅ τε πρὸ τοῦ πάθους καὶ ὁ μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῦ. πρὸ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ πάθους ἐπὶ τρία καὶ ἥμισυ ἔτη τοῖς πᾶσιν ἑαυτὸν παρέχων μαθηταῖς τε καὶ τοῖς μὴ τοιούτοις ἀναγέγραπται, καθ' ὃν <χρόνον> διδασκαλίαις παραδόξοις τε θεραπείαις τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ τὰς δυνάμεις πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς Ἕλλησίν τε καὶ Ἰουδαίοις παρείχετο. μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν τὸν ἴσον, ὡς εἰκός, τῶν ἐτῶν χρόνον τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις συνῆν, δι' ἡμέρων τεσσαράκοντα ὀπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς καὶ συναλιζόμενος, καὶ λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς γοῦν αἱ Πράξεις τῶν ἀποστόλων περιέχουσιν, ὡς εἶναι ταύτην τὴν δηλουμένην τῆς προφητείας τῶν ἐτῶν ἑβδομάδα, καθ' ἣν ἐνεδυνάμωσεν διαθήκην πολλοῖς, τὴν καινὴν δηλαδὴ διαθήκην τοῦ εὐαγγελικοῦ κηρύγματος κρατύνων* (*Demonstr. evang.* VIII, cap. 2, 108–110, p. 400 Fabric.).

[15] As we have seen, this statement should not be understood to mean that for all early Christians the translation was direct from the grave or from the cross. Yet the two were at least loosely connected. No trace of a forty day interval, save in the case of Tertullian's reflection of the Acts account, is known to me down to the end of the second century.

THE NON-SEPTUAGINT ELEMENT IN THE VOCABULARY OF PAUL

DONALD W. RIDDLE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE influence of the Septuagint upon Paul is not open to question. To address attention to the non-Septuagint element[1] in his vocabulary will not suggest any depreciation of that influence. Indeed, as Nageli suggests,[2] the Septuagint is in manifest contrast with Greek literature in this respect, for while no other Greek literary influence upon Paul may be demonstrated, the Septuagint was a library whose effect upon him was powerful.

In reading the letters of Paul the quotations from the Septuagint are themselves an index of this influence. Still more is the impression deepened when one notes the degree to which Paul's vocabulary compares with that of the translation of the Scriptures. One cannot fail to perceive that the apostle was saturated with the spiritual and cultural values projected by this literature. Nevertheless, intimate as was his acquaintance, and high as was his appreciation, the writings of Paul exhibit the considerable use of terms which are not found in it. How considerable the non-Septuagint element in

[1] The term, "non-Septuagint element," is taken to mean words which do not occur either in the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew canonical books or in the so-called Apocrypha. Were the term "Septuagint" defined narrowly, so that words occurring only in the apocryphal books might be included, the element would be correspondingly larger.

[2] Nageli, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus*, 59.

Paul's vocabulary was may be noted from the following compilation:[3]

ἀβαρής (n. S.), 2 Cor. 11 9.
ἀββά (n. S., p. c.), Ga. 4 6; Ro. 8 15.
ἁγνότης (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 6 6; 11 3.
ἁγνῶς (n. S., p. s.), Phl. 1 17.
ἀγριέλαιος (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 11 17, 24.
ἀδάπανος (n. S., p. s.), 1 Cor. 9 18.
ἀδήλως (n. S., p. s.), 1 Cor. 9 26.
ἀδιάλειπτος (n. S.), Ro. 9 2.
ἁδρότης (n. S., p. s.), 2 Cor. 8 20.
ἄθεος (n. S., p. s.), Eph. 2 12.
αἰσχρολογία (n. S., p. s.), Col. 3 8.
αἰσχρότης (n. S., p. s.). Eph. 5 4.
ἀκαιρέομαι (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Phl. 4 10.
ἀλάλητος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ro. 8 26.
ἀλληγορέω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 4 24.
ἄλυπος (n. S., p. s.), Phl. 2 28.
ἀμετακίνητος (n. S., p. s.), 1 Cor. 15 58.
ἀμεταμέλητος (n. S., p. ss.), Ro. 11 29; 2 Cor. 7 10.
ἀμετανόητος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ro. 2 5.
ἄμετρος (n. S., p. s.), 2 Co. 10 13, 15.
ἀνακαινόω (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), 2 Cor. 4 16; Col. 3 10.
ἀνακαίνωσις (n. S., p. c.), Ro. 12 2.
ἀναπέμπω (n. S.), Phm. 11.
ἀναπολόγητος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ro. 1 20; 2 1.
ἀνεκδιήγητος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 9 15.
ἄνοιξις (n. S., p. s.), Eph. 6 19.
ἀνταναπληρόω (n. S., p. s.), Col 1 24.
ἀντιμισθία (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Ro. 1 27; 2 Cor. 6 13.
ἀντιστρατεύομαι (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 7 23.
ἀπαλγέομαι (n. S., p. s.), Eph. 4 19.
ἀπαρασκεύαστος (n. S., p. s), 2 Cor. 9 4.

[3] In the following list, abbreviations are used as follows: n. S. = not occurring in the Septuagint (as defined in note 1); p. c. = post-classical; p. s. = peculiar in the New Testament to this source; p. ss. = peculiar in the New Testament to these (Pauline) sources.

ἀπεκδέχομαι (n. S.), Ro. 8 19, 23, 25; 1 Cor. 1 7; Ga. 5 5; Phl. 3 20.
ἀπέκδυσις (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Col. 2 11.
ἀπεκδύω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Col. 2 15; 3 9.
ἀπελεύθερος (n. S., p. s.), 1 Cor. 7 22.
ἀπερισπάστως (n. S., p. s.), 1 Cor. 7 35.
ἀποβολή (n. S.), Ro. 11 15.
ἀποκαραδοκία (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Ro. 8 19; Phl. 1 20.
ἀποκαταλάσσω (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Eph. 2 16; Col. 1 20, 21.
ἀπόκριμα (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 1 9.
ἀπορφανίζω (n. S., p. s.), 1 Th. 2 17.
ἀποστυγέω (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 12 9.
ἀποτολμάω (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 10 20.
ἀπουσία (n. S., p. s.). Phl. 2 12.
ἀπόχρησις (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Col. 2 22.
ἁρπαγμός (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Phl. 2 6.
ἀρσενοκοίτης (n. S., p. c.), 1 Cor. 6 9.
ἀρχάγγελος (n. S., p. c.), 1 Th. 4 16.
ἀσθένημα (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 15 1.
ἀσπασμός (n. S.), 1 Co. 16 21; Col. 4 18; 2 Th. 3 17.
ἄστοργος (n. S.), Ro. 1 31.
ἀτακτέω (n. S., p. s.), 2 Th. 3 7.
αὐτάρχεια (n. S.), 2 Cor. 9 8.
ἀφειδία (n. s., p. s.), Col. 2 23.
ἀχειροποίητος (n. S., p. c.), 2 Cor. 5 1; Col. 2 11.
βάπτισμα (n. S., p. c.), Ro. 6 4; Eph. 4 5; Col. 2 12.
βιωτικός (n. S.), 1 Cor. 6 3, 4.
βραβεῖον (n. S., p. ss.), 1 Cor. 9. 24, Phl. 3 14.
γαμίζω (n. S., p. c.), 1 Cor. 7 38 (bis).
γυμνιτεύω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor 4 11.
δειγματίζω (n. S., p. c.), Col. 2 15.
διακονέω (n. S.), Ro. 15 25; 2 Cor. 3 3; 8 19, 20; Phm. 13.
διερμηνευτής (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 14 28.
δικαιοκρισία (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ro. 2 5.
δουλαγωγέω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 9 27.
δυνατέω (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Ro. 14 4; 2 Cor. 9 8; 13 3.
ἐθελοθρησκία (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Col. 2 23.
ἐθνικῶς (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 2 14.
εἰδωλολατρία (n. S., p. c.), 1 Cor. 10 14; Ga. 5 20; Col. 3 5.

εἰδωλολατρής (n. S., p. c.), 1 Cor. 5 10, 11; 6 9; 10 7; Eph. 5 5.
ἐκδαπανάω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 12 15.
ἐκδημέω (n. S.), 2 Cor. 5 6, 8, 9.
ἐκπτύω (n. S., p. s.), Ga. 4 14.
ἐλαφρία (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 1 17.
ἐλεεινός (n. S., p. s.), 1 Cor. 15 19.
ἐλλογάω (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Ro. 5 13; Phm. 18.
ἔνδειγμα (n. S., p. s.), 2 Th. 1 5.
ἔνδειξις (n. S., p. ss.), Ro. 3 25, 26; 2 Cor. 8 24; Phl. 1 28.
ἐνδημέω (n. S., p. s.), 2 Cor. 5 6, 7, 8.
ἔνδικος (n. S.), Ro. 3 8.
ἐνέργημα (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 12 6, 10.
ἐνεργής (n. S.), 1 Cor. 16 9; Phm. 9.
ἐνκοπή (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 9 12.
ἐνκόπτω (n. S.), Ro. 15 22: Ga. 5 7; 1 Th. 2 18.
ἐνκρίνω (n. S., p. s.), 2 Co. 10 12.
ἑνότης (n. S., p. s.), Eph. 4 3, 13.
ἐξανάστασις (n. S., p. s.), Phl. 3 11.
ἐξαυτῆς (n. S.), Phl. 2 23.
ἐπαναμμνήσκω (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 15 5.
ἐπεκτείνω (n. S., p. s.), Phl. 3 13.
ἐπενδύω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 5 2, 4.
ἐπιβαρέω (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), 2 Cor. 2 5; 1 Th. 2 9; 2 Th. 3 8.
ἐπίγειος (n. S.), 1 Cor. 15 40 (bis), 2 Cor. 5 1; Phl. 2 10; 3 19.
ἐπιδιατάσσομαι (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 3 15.
ἐπιπόθητος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Phl. 4 1.
ἐπιποθία (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ro. 15 23.
ἐπισκηνόω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 12 9.
ἐπιχορηγία (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Eph. 4 16; Phl. 1 19.
ἐποικοδομέω (n. S.), 1 Cor. 3 10, 12, 14; Eph. 2 20; Col. 2 7.
ἑτεροζυγέω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 6 14.
ἑτέρως (n. S., p. s.), Phl. 3 15.
εὐαγγελιστής (n. S., p. c.), Eph. 4 11.
εὐκαιρέω (n. S., p. c.), 1 Cor. 16 12.
εὐπάρεδρος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 7 35.
εὐπρόσδεκτος (n. S., p. c.), Ro. 15 16, 31; 2 Cor. 6 2; 8 12.
εὐσχημόνως (n. S., p. ss.), Ro. 13 13; 1 Cor. 14 40; 1 Th. 4 12.
εὐτραπελία (n. S., p. s.), Eph. 5 4.

εὐψυχέω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Phl. 2 19.
ἐφάπαξ (n. S.), Ro. 6 12; 1 Cor. 15 6.
ἐφευρετής (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 1 30.
ἡλίκος (n. S.), Col. 2 1.
ἤπιος (n. S.), 1 Th. 2 7.
θέατρον (n. S.), 1 Cor. 4 9.
θεοδίδακτος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Th. 4 9.
θεοστυγής (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 1 30.
θεότης (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Col. 2 9.
θηριομαχέω (n. S., p. c.), 1 Cor. 15 32.
θριαμβεύω (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), 2 Cor. 2 14; Col. 2 15.
ἱερόθυτος (n. S., p. s.), 1 Cor. 10 28.
ἱκανότης (n. S., p. s.), 2 Cor. 3 5.
Ἰουδαικῶς (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 2 14.
καλλιέλαιος (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 11 24.
καλοποιέω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Th. 3 13.
καπηλεύω (n. S., p. s.), 2 Cor. 2 17.
καταβαρέω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 12 16.
καταβραβεύω (n. S., p. s.), Col. 2 18.
κατάκριμα (n. S., p. c.), Ro. 5 16, 18; 8 1.
κατάκρισις (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 3 9; 7 3.
κατάλαλος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ro. 1 30.
καταναρκάω[4] (n. S., p. s.), 2 Cor. 11 9; 12 13, 14.
κατάρτισις (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 13 9.
καταχθόνιος (n. S., p. s.), Phl. 2 10.
κατηχέω (n. S.), Ro. 2 18; 1 Cor. 14 19; Ga. 6 6.
κατοπτρίζω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 3 18.
κενεμβατεύω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Col. 2 18.
κενόδοξος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 5 26.
κημόω (n. S.), 1 Cor. 9 9.
κολακία (n. S., p. s.), 1 Th. 2 5.
κολαφίζω (n. S., p. c.), 1 Cor. 4 11; 2 Cor. 12 7.
κομάω (n. S., p. s.), 1 Cor. 11 14, 15.
κοσκοκράτωρ (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Eph. 6 12.
κυβία (n. S., p. s.), Eph. 4 14.

[4] This term occurs without Hebrew equivalent in Gen. 32 32 (33); Jb. 33 19, and Dan. (LXX) 11 6.

κυριότης (n. S., p. c.), Eph. 1 21; Col. 1 16.
λογία (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 16 1, 2.
λογικός (n. S.), Ro. 12 1.
μακαρισμός (n. S., p. ss.), Ro. 4 6, 9; Ga. 4 15.
μάκελλον (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 10 25.
μεθοδία (n. S., p. c., p. s.) Eph. 4 14; 6 11.
μεσότοιχον (n. S., p. c., p. s.) Eph. 2 14.
μήπω (n. S.) Ro. 9 11.
μιμητής (n. S.), 1 Cor. 4 16; 11 1; Eph. 5 1; 1 Th. 1 6; 2 14.
μομφή (n. S., p. s.), Col. 3 13.
μόρφωσις (n. S., p. c.), Ro. 2 20.
μωρολογία (n. S., p. s.), Eph. 5 4.
ναυαγέω (n. S.), 2 Cor. 11 25.
νεκρόω (n. S., p. c.), Ro. 4 19, Col. 3 5.
νέκρωσις (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Ro. 4 19; 2 Cor. 4 10.
νηπιάζω (n. S., p. s.), 1 Cor. 14 20.
νήφω (n. S.), 1 Th. 5 6, 8.
νυχθήμερον (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 11 25.
ὀκταήμερος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Phl. 3 5.
ὁλοθρευτής (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 10 10.
ὁλοτελής (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Th. 5 23.
ὀρθοποδέω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 2 14.
ὄσφρησις (n. S.), 1 Cor. 12 17.
ὀφειλέτης (n. S.), Ro. 1 14; 8 12; 15 27; Ga. 5 3.
ὀφειλή (n. S., p. c.), Ro. 13 7, 1 Cor. 7 3.
ὀφθαλμοδουλία (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Eph. 6 6; Col. 3 22.
πάθημα (n. S.), Ro. 7 5; 8 15; 1 Cor. 1 5, 6, 7; Ga. 5 24; Phl. 3 10; Col. 1 24.
παιδαγωγός (n. S., p. ss.), 1 Cor. 4 15; Ga. 3 24, 25.
παλαιότης (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 7 6.
πάλη (n. S., p. s.), Eph. 6 12.
παραβουλεύομαι (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Phl. 2 30.
παρακοή (n. S.), Ro. 5 19, 2 Cor. 10 6.
παραπλήσιον (n. S., p. s.), Phl. 2 27.
παραχειμάζω (n. S.), 1 Cor. 16 6.
παρείσακτος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 2 4.
παρεισέρχομαι (n. S., p. ss.), Ro. 5 20; Ga. 2 4.
πάρεσις (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 3 25.

πειθός (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 2 4.
πεισμονή (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 5 8.
πεντηκοστή (n. S., p. c.), 1 Cor. 16 8.
περισσοτέρως (n. S.), 2 Cor. 1 12; 2 4; 7 13, 15; 11 23; 12 15; Ga. 1 14; Phl. 1 14; 1 Th. 2 17.
περπερεύομαι (n. S., p. c.), 1 Cor. 13 4.
πέρυσι (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 8 10; 9 2.
πιθανολογία (n. S., p. s.), Col. 2 4.
πληροφορία (n. S., p. c.), Col. 2 2; 1 Th. 1 5.
πλουσίως (n. S.), Col. 3 16.
πνευματικός (n. S.), Ro. 1 11; 7 14; 15 27; 1 Cor. 2 13, 15; 3 1; 9 11; 10 3 (bis), 4; 12 1; 14 1, 37; 15 44 (bis), 46; Ga. 6 1; Eph. 1 3; 5 19; 6 12.
πνευματικῶς (n. S., p. c.), 1 Cor. 2 14.
πολυποίκιλος (n. S., p. s.), Eph. 3 10.
πραιτώριον (n. S., p. c.), Phl. 1 13.
πρεσβεύω (n. S., p. ss.), 2 Cor. 5 20; Eph. 6 20.
προαιτιάομαι (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ro. 3 9.
προακούω (n. S., p. s.), Col. 1 5.
προαμαρτάνω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 12 21; 13 2.
προελπίζω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Eph. 1 12.
προενάρχομαι (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 8 6, 10.
προεπαγγέλλομαι (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Ro. 1 2; 2 Cor. 9 5.
προευαγγελίζομαι (n. S., p. s., p. s.), Ga. 3 8.
προκαταρτίζω (n. S., p. s.), 2 Cor. 9 5.
προκυρόω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 3 17.
προορίζω (n. S., p. c.), Ro. 8 29, 30; 1 Cor. 2 7; Eph. 1 5, 11.
προπάσχω (n. S., p. s.), 1 Th. 2 2.
προσαγωγή (n. S.), Ro. 5 2; Eph. 2 18; 3 12.
προσανατίθημι (n. S., p. s.), Ga. 1 16; 2 6.
προσκαρτέρησις (n. S., p. c.), Eph. 6 18.
πρόσλημψις (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 11 15.
προσοφείλω (n. S., p. s.), Phm. 19.
προστάτις (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 16 2.
προσωπολημψία (n. S., p. c.), Ro. 2 11; Eph. 6 9; Col. 3 25.
προφητικός (n. S., p. c.), Ro. 16 26.
πτύρομαι (n. S., p. s.), Phl. 1 28.
πυκτεύω (n. S., p. s.), 1 Cor. 9 26.

πώρωσις (n. S.), Ro. 11 25; Eph. 4 18.
ῥιπή (n. S., p. s.). 1 Cor. 15 52.
ῥυτίς (n. S., p. s.), Eph. 5 27.
σαίνω (n. S., p. s.), 1 Th. 3 3.
σαργάνη (n. S.), 2 Cor. 11 33.
σαρκικός (n. S.), Ro. 15 27; 1 Cor. 3 3; 9 11; 2 Cor. 1 12; 10 4.
σπίλος (n. S.), Eph. 5 27.
σταυρός (n. S.), 1 Cor. 1 17, 18; Ga. 5 11; 6 12, 14; Col. 1 18; 2 14; Eph. 2 16; Phl. 2 8; 3 18.
συλαγωγέω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Col. 2 8.
συμμορφίζω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Phl. 3 10.
συμμορφός (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Ro. 8 29; Phl. 3 21.
συμφυλέτης (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Th. 2 14.
συμφώνησις (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 6 15.
συναγωνίζομαι (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 15 30.
συναθλέω (n. S., p. s.), Phl. 1 27; 4 3.
συναιχμάλωτος (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Ro. 16 7; Col. 4 10; Phm. 23.
συναναμίγνυμι (n. S., p. ss.), 1 Cor. 5 9, 11; 2 Th. 3 14.
συναρμολογέω (n. S., p. c.), Eph. 2 21; 4 16.
συνδοξάζω (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 8 17.
συνέκδημος (n. S., p. c.), 2 Cor. 8 19.
συνζάω (n. S.), Ro. 6 8; 2 Cor. 7 3.
συνζητητής (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 1 20.
συνζωοποιέω (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Eph. 2 5; Col. 2 13.
συνήδομαι (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 7 22.
συνηλικιώτης (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 1 14.
συνθάπτομαι (n. S., p. ss.), Ro. 6 4; Col 2 12.
συνκατάθεσις (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 6 16.
συνκληρονόμος (n. S., p. c.), Ro. 8 17; Eph. 3 6.
συνκοινωνέω (n. S.), Eph. 5 11; Phl. 4 14.
συνκοινωνός (n. S., p. c.), Ro. 11 17; 1 Cor. 9 23; Phl. 1 7.
συνμαρτυρέω (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 2 15; 8 16; 9 1.
συνμέτοχος (n. S., p. s.), Eph. 3 6; 5 7.
συνμιμητής (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Phl. 3 17.
συνπαρακελέομαι (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 1 12.
συνπέμπω (n. S., p. s.). 2 Cor. 8 18, 22.
συνπολίτης (n. S., p. s.), Eph. 2 19.
συνσταυρόω (n. S.), Ro. 6 6; Ga. 2 20.

συνστενάζω (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 8 22.
συνστοιχέω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 4 25.
συνστρατιώτης (n. S., p. ss.), Phl. 2 25; Phm. 2.
συνσχηματίζομαι (n. S.), Ro. 12 2.
σύνσωμος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Eph. 3 6.
συνυποκρίνομαι (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 2 13.
συνυπουργέω (n. S., p. s.), 2 Cor. 1 11.
σύνφημι (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 7 16.
σύνψυχος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Phl. 2 2.
συνωδίνω (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 8 22.
συστατικός (n. S., p. s.), 2 Cor. 3 1.
σχίσμα (n. S.), 1 Cor. 1 10; 11 18; 12 25.
σωματικῶς (n. S., p. s.), Col. 2 9.
σωφρονέω (n. S.), Ro. 12 3; 2 Cor. 5 13.
ταπεινοφροσύνη (n. S., p. c.), Eph. 4 2; Phl. 2 3; Col. 2 18, 23; 3 12;
τεκνίον (n. S., p. c.), Ga. 4 19.
τολμηροτέρως (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 15 15.
τυπικῶς (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 10 11.
υἱοθεσία (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Ro. 8 15, 23; 9 4; Ga. 4 5; Eph. 1 5.
ὑπέρ (adv.) (n. S., p. S.), 2 Cor. 11 23.
ὑπέρακμος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 7 36.
ὑπεραυξάνω (n. S., p. s.), 2 Th. 1 3.
ὑπερέκεινα (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 10 16.
ὑπερεκπερισσεύω (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Eph. 3 20; 1 Th. 3 10; 5 13.
ὑπερεκτείνω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 10 14.
ὑπερεντυγχάνω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ro. 8 26.
ὑπερλίαν (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 11 5; 12 11.
ὑπερπερισσεύω (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), Ro. 5 20; 2 Cor. 7 4.
ὑπόδικος (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 3 19.
ὑποπιάζω (n. S.), 1 Cor. 9 27.
φανέρωσις[5] (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), 1 Cor. 12 7; 2 Cor. 4 2.
φειδομένως (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 9 6.
φιλοξενία (n. S.), Ro. 12 13.
φρεναπαντάω (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ga. 6 3.
φυσικός (n. S.), Ro. 1 26, 27.

[5] Found in Cod. Ven. Lev. 8 8 as v. l. for *δήλωσις*.

φυσιόω (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), 1 Cor. 4 18, 19; 5 2; 8 1; 13 4; Col. 2 18.
φυσίωσις (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 12 20.
χειροτονέω (n. S., p. s.), 2 Cor. 8 19.
χοικός (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 15 47. 48, 49.
χρηστεύομαι (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 1 Cor. 13 4.
χρηστολογία (n. S., p. c., p. s.), Ro. 16 18.
ψευδαδελφός (n. S., p. c., p. ss.), 2 Cor. 11 26; Ga. 2 4.
ψευδαπόστολος (n. S., p. c., p. s.), 2 Cor. 11 13.
ψιθυριστής (n. S., p. s.), Ro. 1 30.
ὡσπερεί (n. S., p. s.), 1 Cor. 15 8.

To begin with the statistical data, the proportion of the non-Septuagint element to the total vocabulary of Paul is relatively high. The proportion varies in the letters from 2.5% in 2 Thessalonians to 9.2% in Colossians, with an average of 6.92%. This average is exceeded in the New Testament by 1 Peter (7.2%), 2 Peter (7.6%), Acts (8.1), and the Pastoral Epistles (9.6%). The phenomena of single letters is perhaps more instructive. For example, Paul's letter to the Romans and the Epistle to the Hebrews are approximately of equal bulk, but in Hebrews the non-Septuagint element of the vocabulary represents but 5.1% of the whole, while in Romans the proportion is 8.2%. More extreme contrasts might be suggested, e. g., Galatians or Ephesians is about the same in extent of vocabulary as the Epistle of James, but in this source the non-Septuagint element is almost neglegible (3.7%), while in the two Pauline letters it is more considerable (6.2%, 8.3%).

To contrast Paul at this point with writers of other literary types throws the non-Septuagint element into still higher relief, but it is perhaps of slight value, since subject matter and literary purpose are so different in the several cases. However, the following proportions are cited, without any special importance being urged: the non-Septuagint element in the vocabulary of the Matthean Gospel is 4.9%, of the Marcan 5.7%, of the Gospel according to Luke 5.4%, of Luke-Acts the average is 6.75%, of Fourth Gospel 4.6%, of Acts 8.1%, of Paul the average is 6.92%, of the Pastoral Epistles the average is 9.6%, of Hebrews 5.1%, of the Epistle of James 3.7%, of 1 Peter

7.2%, of 2 Peter 7.6%, of the Epistle of Jude 5.9%, of the Johannine Epistles the average is 1.6%, of the Apocalypse 4.3%.

It may be of some importance to note the distribution of the non-Septuagint words in the several Pauline letters.[6] The following Table exhibits the phenomena:

Source	Whole number	n.S. p.c.	n.S. p.s.	n.S. p.c. p.s.	n.S. p.ss.	n.S. p.c. p.ss.	Total	%
Romans	1052	24	13	24	9	7	10	87	8.2
1 Corinthians	949	19	12	11	17	3	2	64	6.6
2 Corinthians	774	13	4	14	24	4	10	69	8.9
Galatians	516	9	3	2	15	4	2	35	6.2
Ephesians	502	7	11	14	4	12	6	43	8.3
Philippians	438	8	3	10	9	3	3	36	8.7
Colossians	412	6	9	8	7	1	7	38	9.2
1 Thessalonians	345	6	2	3	3	1	2	17	5.2
2 Thessalonians	242	1	0	3	1	0	1	6	2.5
Philemon	130	4	0	1	1	0	1	7	5.4

Key: n. S. = non-Septuagint words not peculiar in the New Testament to Paul

n. S., p. c. = non-Septuagint words not peculiar in the New Testament whose occurrence in Greek literature is solely in post- or non-classical sources

n. S., p. s. = non-Septuagint words peculiar in the New Testament to this source

n. S., p. c., p. s. = non-Septuagint, non-classical words peculiar in the New Testament to this source

n. S., p. ss. = non-Septuagint words peculiar in the New Testament to two or more Pauline sources

n. S., p. c., p. ss. = non-Septuagint, non-classical words peculiar in the New Testament to two or more Pauline sources

[6] In the present study questions of genuineness are not raised; the familiar ten letters are regarded as Pauline.

From the list of the non-Septuagint words in the Pauline vocabulary and from the Table exhibiting their distribution it may be generalized that they represent a relatively large proportion of the total vocabulary of Paul. The examination of individual terms demands the recognition that the group contains some of the most important and most characteristic words by which his teachings were expressed. It is interesting, for example, to attempt to imagine a Pauline letter which omitted such concepts as "cross," "serve," "suffering," "spiritual," or "sonship." Yet the non-Septuagint element in Paul's vocabulary is inclusive of *βάπτισμα, διακονέω, εἰδωλολατρία, εἰδωλολάτρης, πάθημα, πνευματικός, σαρκικός, σταυρός,* and *υἱοθεσία.* Of less frequency, but characteristically Pauline, are *ἀπεκδέχομαι, ἀσπασμός, ἔνδειξις, ἐποικοδομέω, μιμητής,* and *φυσιόω,* which belong to the group. It is evident, and without doubt significant, that some of the most important and typical terms of Paul's vocabulary are of extra-Septuagint origin.

One group of words of special interest of which the source is non-Septuagint expresses certain phases of Paul's world-view. When he wrote to the Philippians in the vein in which a cosmic reverence of Christ was introduced, he urged humility (*ταπεινοφροσύνη*) as a virtue, citing that Christ Jesus did not regard it as a thing to be grasped (*ἁρπαγμόν*) to be equal with God, but undertook his well-known fate, on account of which God highly exalted him and gave him the name to which every knee should bow, even of the creatures *ἐπιγείων* and *καταχθονίων,* using these non-Septuagint terms. The Ephesian letter reminds its readers that they are wrestling with no less than with *κοσμοκράτορας* of this darkness, with the *πνευματικά* of evil in the heavenly place; these words are not to be found in the Greek translation of the Scriptures. The term *κυριότης* in Ephesians 1 21 and Colossians 1 16 has similar force. The bodies *ἐπίγεια* which in 1 Corinthians 15 40 are contrasted with the terrestrial are of such a world-view; in the same passage the beings which are *χοϊκός* similarly involve non-Septuagint derivation. Again, since Paul's was a theological world-view, the characterization of the Ephesians as *ἄθεοι* may be cited. There may be added his picture of the cosmic fate of the individual (in Romans and

elsewhere) as the παθήματα of the present are not to be compared with the about to be revealed glory, as the ἀποκαραδοκία of the creation awaits (ἀπεκδέχεται) the revelation of the sons of God. Indeed, the entire creation is involved, as it συνστενάζει and συνωδίνει until now, yearning for υἱοθεσία, which includes the redemption of the body. There is a world-view implied in that reference to the work of Christ which appears in Colossians as Paul remarks that Christ, ἀπεκδυσάμενος the principalities and powers, ἐδειγμάτισεν in public, θριαμβεύσας over them in the display. Finally, among the supernatural beings the ἀρχάγγελος is mentioned.

Another set of phenomena which introduces non-Septuagint terms is the distinction between Judaism and the new way of life. Attention may be called to Paul's language in Galatians and elsewhere. He states that his rebuke of Peter was concerning the inconsistency of one who lived ἐθνικῶς compelling non-Jews to live Ἰουδαϊκῶς; such an one was guilty of hypocrisy (συνυποκρίνομαι is his term). Mention may be made in this connection of the references to idolatry, which introduce the terms εἰδωλολατρία and εἰδωλολάτρης and of the terminology by which the distinction between the spiritual (πνευματικός) and the fleshly (σαρκικός) or natural (φυσικός) was made.

The discussion of the way of life suggests the qualitative terms, which are among the most interesting as well as of great importance. Of such sort are ἁγνότης (purity), ταπεινοφροσύνη (humility), φιλοξενία (hospitality). The Corinthians are exhorted to be immovable (ἀμετακίνητος), the Ephesians have recommended the value of unity (ἑνότης); for Paul to know the state of the Philippians will make him to be of good courage (εὐψυχέω), he urges the Thessalonians to be sober (νήφω), and charges that some in Antioch did not walk rightly (ὀρθοποδέω) according to the truth of the gospel. A representative virtue is perseverance (προσκαρτέρησις). On the other hand, the terms for vices and for negative qualities make up an even larger list. For example, the following partial group will be recognized as characteristic: αἰσχρολογία (abusive language), αἰσχρότης (shame), ἀμετανόητος (impenitent), ἀρσενοκοίτης (a sodomite), ἄστοργος (lacking natural affection), ἐθελοθρησκία (self-imposed worship), ἐλαφρία (levity),

εὐτραπελία (ribaldry), θεοστυγής (hateful to God), κατάλαλος (a defamer), κολακία (flattery), κυβία (trickery), μωρολογία (foolish talking), παρακοή (disobedience), σαίνω (to beguile), ψιθυριστής (a whisperer).

To turn to a pleasanter aspect, some of Paul's most effective figures involve his non-Septuagint vocabulary. Among these are his references to the wild- and the garden-olive (ἀγριέλαιος and καλλιέλαιος), notable as one of the few nature figures which occur. Somewhat similar as a rural figure is the characterization of the marriage of the believer with a pagan as being unequally yoked (ἑτεροζυγοῦντες). The barrier between Jew and non-Jew which was broken down in Hellenistic Christianity was called a "middle wall of partition" (μεσότοιχον). The contemplation of the Lord's glory is as looking in a mirror (κατοπτριζόμενοι). The building figure is common in Paul's writings, in an especially effective form in Ephesians, where in the household of God every building is fitted together (συναρμολογουμένη). Among the most telling examples are Paul's characterizations of himself and certain associates as fellow soldiers and fellow prisoners (συνστρατιώτης, συναιχμάλωτος).

Certain of the Pauline figures and casual references are of such instructiveness that they deserve special mention. When he speaks of the adherents of the new cult as a spectacle (θέατρον) of the world it is impossible to miss either the force of the figure or to recognize the culture to which it belongs. The same is true of his suggestion that he fought in the arena (ἐθηριομάχησα). The source and the aptness of his references to the games as figuring the discipline of the new life are equally clear; all run in the stadium, but only one receives the prize (βραβεῖον); Paul does not run uncertainly (ἀδήλως); he fights so as not to strike the air (πυκτεύω); he pummels his body so as (δουλαγωγέω) to enslave it. Doubtless it is from the games that he derives his terms "to strive with," "to agonize with" (συναθλέω, συναγωνίζομαι), and the term used as he pictures himself pressing on toward the goal of the prize (βραβεῖον) of the high calling. Greek life in other aspects furnishes additional figures of high effectiveness, e. g., the Law as the slave (παιδαγωγός) leading the child to his master for instruction, or, again,

Christ triumphing (θριαμβεύσας) over the principalities and powers; the origin of the term is made but slightly more obvious when compared with the term θρίαμβος, the festal hymn to Bacchus. A custom which troubled sensitive disciples suggests a familiar phase of Greek life as some questioned the propriety of eating meat sacrificed to idols (ἱερόθυτος) and sold in the slaughter-house (μάκελλον). Polybius' use of the term συνστοιχέω to mean "to stand in rank with" suggests the possibility that its use in Galatians 4 25 is due to Hellenistic influence; this despite the Jewish content of the passage. The use in the same context of ἀλληγορέω heightens the probability. It is interesting also that within a Jewish content another non-Septuagint term appears as Paul uses the figure of the codicil to a will; at any rate, the term ἐπιδιατάσσομαι occurs of wills in the papyri. In 2 Thessalonians 3 7 he uses the word ἀτακτέω, which means primarily of soldiers marching to quit the ranks, but which has the picturesque use in the papyri of truancy on the part of an apprentice.

Another group of terms which are worthy of special discussion is the forensic group, of which it is certainly notable that such a proportion belongs to the non-Septuagint category. Among these the range of concepts includes ὑπόδικος (brought to trial), προαιτιάομαι (to accuse beforehand), ἀπόκριμα (a judicial sentence), κατάκριμα (the penalty), and δικαιοκρισία (just judgment), not to mention the forensic implication of such words as ἀναπολόγητος (without defence), συνζητητής (a disputant), συνκληρονόμος (fellow heir), ὀφειλή (one's due), ὀφειλέτης (a debtor), and ἐπιδιατάσσομαι (to add a provision to a document).

It has been noted by Professor Glover[7] that Paul is fond of terms compounded with σύν and ὑπέρ. A number of these compounds are of the extra-Septuagint vocabulary. Even the statistics are notable. Of the 21 compounds of ὑπέρ which he uses, 8 are non-Septuagint, among them such representative ones as ὑπερπερισσεύω, ὑπερεκπερισσεύω, ὑπεραυξάνω, and ὑπερλίαν. Of the 89 compounds of σύν, 39 are words which do not occur in the Septuagint. These make up a considerable part

[7] Glover, *Paul of Tarsus*, 178, 212.

of the characteristic vocabulary of Paul, as appears when the entire list is consulted. Let the following examples suffice: *συναθλέω, συναιχμάλωτος, συναναμίγνυμι, συνζάω, συνζωοποιέω, συνθάπτομαι, συνκληρονόμος, συνκοινωνέω, συνκοινωνός, συνμαρτυρέω, συνμέτοχος, συνπέμπω, συνσταυρόω,* and *συνστρατιώτης.*

The hyperbolical force of some of these terms is an obvious feature, one which is thoroughly Pauline, which has also been emphasized by Professor Glover.[8] Another of this sort is *περισσοτέρως,* which occurs 6 times in 2 Corinthians in Paul's list of his adventures, and once each in Galatians, Philippians, and 1 Thessalonians.

It is unnecessary to discuss at length the character of these terms. Their Hellenistic quality is clear. While some have occurrence in classical Greek sources, nearly one-half (142) are found only in post-classical writers. It requires but a cursory examination of representative collections of the non-literary papyri, or of the vocabulary of Moulton-Milligan, to recognize the connection of the non-Septuagint vocabulary of Paul with these specimens of writing. To mention but a few, *ἀγριέλαιος, αἰσχρολογία, ἀμετανόητος, ἀποκαραδοκία, ἀτακτέω, δικαιοκρισία, ἐλλογάω, ἐξαυτῆς, ἐπιδιατάσσομαι, λογία* (cf. *λογεύω* in the papyri), *ὀφειλή,* and *πέρυσι* sufficiently illustrate the point. *Ἀπόκριμα* appears in inscriptions as well as in the papyri. *Συνπολίτης* is found in inscriptions, and although found also in Euripides was condemned by the Atticists. *Υἱοθεσία* is found in inscriptions. Doubtless it would merely be to labor the point to multiply citations.

By way of generalization, the statement with which the study opened may be made positively. The elements in the vocabulary of Paul which correlate with the Septuagint have received adequate exploitation, with the unquestionable conclusion that the use of the Septuagint by Paul was voluminous and its influence upon him powerful. But there were phases of his experience, elements of his convictions, and aspects of his organization of experience which were otherwise based. Consequently, to know the man and his religion demands the investigation of the less obvious relationships.

[8] *ibid.*, 178, 195.

The present study is a small contribution in this direction, suggesting the application of a method. The isolation of the non-Septuagint element in Paul's vocabulary throws into clearer relief his reactions to certain religious values which are inclusive of, e. g., favorite and typical concepts, qualitative distinctions, distinctions of the particular way of life of the developing Christian cult, and figures which indicate positive response to environmental situations. In a word, the isolation of this element of terminology emphasizes the Hellenistic values implied by their linguistic relations. The effect is to open additional avenues by which one is enabled to trace influences which contributed to the organization of the personality of this early Christian leader. Taking these values into connection with the Jewish values which they complement, one may hope the better to know him. These data discover the man writing in the language of his place and time, making favorable adjustments to particularly Hellenistic values, vitally reflecting the common life in his use of the common tongue. One is thus permitted intimately to understand the processes by which Paul was conscious of his debt to the Greek and to the barbarian. More importantly, one is vouchsafed the privilege of realizing some of the experiences which were basic to the development of the ideal of a religious community in which distinctions of Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, slave, and freedman disappear. The mechanics of linguistic study bring the reward of the discovery of some of the important techniques and methods in the religious leadership of early Christianity.

"PROTO-LUKE" AND THE "CHICAGO THEORY" OF THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

ALFRED M. PERRY
BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

IT is one of the great misfortunes of American Biblical scholarship that President E. D. Burton never gave adequate presentation of his solution of the Synoptic Problem. His fullest treatment, in the Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago, deals quite largely with the general aspects of the problem, while his specific presentations of his own theory, in a presidential address before this Society and elsewhere, were none of them built upon that cumulation of minute bits of evidence which often helps to carry conviction. It is gratifying, therefore, to one of his pupils, to find in the notable work of Canon Streeter a tacit acceptance of Dr. Burton's cardinal principles. These may be summarized, briefly.

First, Dr. Burton started with the premise, not new with him, that the key to the Synoptic Problem is to be found, not in Matthew, but in Luke. Proceeding thence, by observation of Luke's use of Mark, he deduced two further propositions:—(second), that Luke used his sources in order; and (third), that these sources were incorporated so far as possible in blocks. These three propositions are fundamental to Canon Streeter's work, likewise; but he has advanced the solution of the Problem measurably with the further proposition that Luke's primary source is to be found, not in Mark, but in an earlier edition of his non-Markan sources.

At first sight, this last observation is entirely destructive of Dr. Burton's theory. If all the non-Markan sources were

united in a single composition, before the addition of Mark, it is obvious that we no longer have any objective clue to the manner in which *these* sources were combined,—and we must fall back either upon the precarious conclusions to be drawn from the Matthew parallels, or upon the uncertain declarations of the *Formgeschichtliche* school. This objection, however, may be overstated. If, as Canon Streeter and Dr. Vincent Taylor suppose, the same hand guided the composition both of Proto-Luke and of the complete Gospel, the presumption will remain, after all, that not only were Mark and Proto-Luke interwoven in blocks, but that the more primitive sources were employed in a like fashion, in the composition of Proto-Luke itself. Canon Streeter himself recognizes the cogency of this conclusion, and applies it tentatively in the Great Interpolation to four blocks of material which he derives from Q. It is along a similar line that I wish in this paper to proceed to a reexamination of Dr. Burton's solution, testing the assumption which he and Canon Streeter have both made, -with good reason, I believe,—that the sources of Proto-Luke were employed in blocks, so far as possible.

I

The first point to be examined is the unity of the section which Burton designated G; that is, to answer the question whether the non-Markan materials of Luke 3–7 represent the interweaving of two sources, Q and L, as most scholars have supposed, or whether the phenomena of single and double tradition here are to be ascribed to the selection by Matthew of portions of a narrative which betrays internal coherence throughout. I believe there is evidence to support the latter view.

1. My first example is from Luke 4, the non-Markan portions of which include the narratives of the Temptation and the Rejection at Nazareth.

The Temptation narrative (Lk. 4 1–13) shows unmistakeably a common literary dependence of Matthew and Luke, and is regularly assigned to Q. Like the corresponding narrative in Mark, the story must have Messianic significance, and some

bearing, therefore, upon the character which Jesus' ministry is supposed to have taken. This is here presented in a negative aspect: the three temptations represent three popular conceptions of the program of the Messiah,—that offering material prosperity (cf. Joel 2 19–27, etc.), that of imperialism (cf. Ps. Sol. 17 22–42, etc.), and that of the supernatural restoration of Israel (cf., e. g., Enoch 45–51). These three popular Messianic ideas are all rejected,—a point of some value, not only in the definition of the program of Jesus, but equally in the early Christian apologetic. As an introduction to the completed gospel the rejection of the miraculous (in the temptation to leap from the Temple pinnacle) is difficult, but it will soon appear that this is characteristic of the source.

The order of Luke seems the original one, both in the dramatic introduction of Scripture by the Tempter also, and in the conclusive character of the final quotation, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Matthew, by his changes, has secured an arrangement much better homiletically;—the spiritual view of life, reverent trust in God, absolute fidelity to God. The introductory verses in Luke, vv. 1–2 a, seem to be an editorial preface largely based on reminiscence of Mark.

Luke 4 14–15 are likewise an editorial transition, on the basis of three verses of Mark (Mk. 1 14; 1 28; 1 39). They are, however, unnecessary; for the transition from v. 13 to v. 16 is easy, despite the change of subject.

It should now be observed that the narrative of the Rejection at Nazareth, Luke 4 16–30, forms the exact complement of the Temptation narrative. While the latter defines the program of Jesus negatively, it is here set forth explicitly. This program is announced to be that of bringing in the Kingdom, not by material benefits or healing, not by the prestige of miraculous signs, not by insurrection against the Roman imperium, but by preaching and persuading the hearts of men. So we have the prominent use of the passage from Isaiah, with its emphasis upon evangelization and preaching,—a use which is paralleled in Q materials elsewhere in the reference to the "sign of Jonah" (Lk. 11 29–30) and in the reference to this same passage in the answer to John the Baptist (Lk. 7 22). The same thought seems

to be carried out in the later reference to the miracles of Elijah and Elisha (vv. 25–27), which ought to be interpreted, not of the rejection of Israel (as Luke did), but as meaning, "Though signs and wonders may be necessary for the Gentiles in their ignorance, for the Chosen People the Messianic appeal is one of preaching." It is true that v. 23 seems to prevent this interpretation by its implication of a definite refusal to work miracles but it is probable that this verse is an editorial interpolation,[1] since it interrupts the connection between the challenge of v. 22, "Is not this the son of Joseph?," and its answer in v. 24, "no prophet without honor." Moreover the connection of this verse with the context is poor, its reference to previous miracles betrays both a different viewpoint and a faulty setting, and it bears several marks of "Lukan" style,[2] *εἶπεν πρός*, *πάντως*, and possibly also the "medical" proverb.

Further indications that the remainder of the section is allied to the adjacent Q materials are to be found in the Semitic coloring of the narrative, noted by Wellhausen (*Lukasevangelium*, S. 11), and in the presence of the Old Testament quotation and in the way it is used (cf. Lk. 3 3–5, and, for the subject, 7 22; cf. also use of the O. T. in 4 3–12). Finally, Matthew gives a hint that he had this passage in his source, in his use of the name "Nazara" and his reference to Jesus' removal to Capernaum (Mt. 4 13; cf. Lk. 4 16, 31). Assuming Matthew's acquaintance with the passage, some reasons for his omission of it can be given: first, he was following Mark as his principal source, and would naturally choose the Markan version of two parallel accounts, especially when (as in this case) it was the shorter, as he regularly compresses narratives. Moreover, it is quite possible that he recognized some of the difficulties of the passage, such as the contradictory attitudes to miracles, and the apparent emphasis on the rejection of Israel. We may conclude, therefore, that there are sufficient indications, not

[1] Parsons, E. W., *Historical Examination of some Non-Markan Elements in Luke*, p. 74 n.; Bultmann, R., *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, S. 16.

[2] Hawkins, J. C., *Horae Synopticae*[2], pp. 35–51.

only that Luke 4 1–13 and 4 16–30 stood in the same source, but that Matthew seems to have found them so.

2. We turn now to the Preaching of John, Luke 3 1–18, which Canon Streeter has already shown[3] stood at the beginning of a block of materials of which only a few editorial touches are derivable from Mark, and most of which must be derived from, or paralleled by, Q.

Harnack[4] derives Lk. 3 3 a, 7–9, 16–17 from Q. In addition to these verses Q must have had some equivalent for vv. 2, 3 b (probably as in Mt. 3 1–2), and apparently also an equivalent for v. 4, as in Matt. 3 3 (where Matthew agrees with Luke in the omission of the Malachi quotation). The hand of the editor, either of Proto-Luke or of the complete gospel, is apparent in the chronological summary (vv. 1–2 a), in the assimilation to Mark of vv. 3 b–4, 16, and in the transitional sentences, vv. 7 a, 15, 18. Seven verses of single tradition, Lk. 3 5–6, 10–14, still remain: do they belong to the same source as the sections ascribed to Q?

Of Lk. 3 5–6 there is little to say. It is quite possible that Luke himself carried on the quotation in order to reach the Messianic promise of v. 6, which announces more clearly what is already implicit in the second clause of the quotation. But it should be noted that this is not Luke's usual procedure: the Old Testament quotations in Q are given by Luke and Matthew in close agreement, except in the next section, where Lk. 4 3 has the *shorter* form. In making use of the Old Testament quotations in Mark, Luke abridges in five cases (Lk. 8 10; 19 46; 20 17; 21 27; 22 69) and in some ten cases[5] includes the quotation in the omission of other Markan materials. I can find no other place where he has expanded an Old Testament quotation; but full quotation of the older Scripture does seem to be a characteristic of the non-Markan source.

Lk. 3 10–14 present a greater problem. They have been both doubtfully assigned to Q (as by Streeter, p. 291) and rigorously excluded from that document. But they do give

[3] Streeter, B. H., *The Four Gospels*, pp. 205–207

[4] Harnack, A., *The Sayings of Jesus*, Eng. tr., p. 127.

[5] Cf. Mark 7 6–7; 8 18; 10 7–8; 13 12, 19, 22, 24; 14 27, 34; 15 34.

evidence of relationship to the rest of the block. First of all (merely negative proof) it should be noted that they do not *create* a break in John's discourse,—that break is there already. Assuming, if you please, that Matthew presents the original form of Q, the demand for fruit in the last clause of Mt. 3 10 makes but a poor connection with the personal reference to baptism in the first clause of v. 11 (and the common order of Matthew and Luke must be that of their source), although the mention of the axe in the *first* clause of v. 10 might lead up to the announcement of the Coming One in the *second* clause of v. 11. No argument against these verses, therefore, can be drawn from the want of connection. On the contrary, the question of Lk. 3 10, "What shall we do?" is the natural response to the excoriation of the hearers and the demand for "good fruit" which precede, and the connection remains even though the words be merely an editorial inference from the reply of the Baptist in v. 11. As for more positive evidence, v. 11, ("give your shirt") has a parallel in thought in a later Q passage (Lk. 6 29–30; but cf. Mk. 6 9); and v. 12, the baptism of publicans, is referred to later in 7 29–30 (peculiar to Lk. in a Q context), while the general tenor of the verses, "the poor are evangelized" is the theme of the Old Testament quotation in Lk. 4 18 (which we have already assigned to the Common Source), and reflects the general emphasis of that passage on the prophetic and ethical character of Jesus' mission. These verses also, therefore, may be considered to have stood in the common source, and to have been omitted by Matthew,—perhaps for want of interest in John's ethical mission, since the Baptist has become for him simply the Forerunner (cf. his use of Q and Mark materials, Mt. 11 12–15).

Between Lk. 3 14 and 16, however, there still remains a break, and v. 15 may well be an editorial insertion to disguise the omission of some more definite announcement, originally in Q, to prepare for the off-hand reference to the "Coming One" in v. 16. Aside from this omission and the editorial modifications already noted, it is probable that Lk. 3 2 b–18 represents a block corresponding to the material as it was presented in the common source of Luke and Matthew,—though the original language

of the source may well be better preserved by Matthew at several points.

3. The same is probably true, in perhaps lesser degree, of the rest of the chapter. Lk. 3 19–20 have an obviously editorial flavor, and may well have been imported to anticipate or replace a fuller account of the Baptist's fate (cf. also Mk. 1 14).

Lk. 3 21–22 represent an event that must have been narrated in Q; and the suggestion made by Harnack and by Streeter[6] that the "Western text" represents the original reading of Luke and of Q is attractive. Note, further, the common alteration, *ἀνεῳχθῆναι.* The stylistic peculiarities of Luke are numerous, however, and the section as it stands must be largely editorial, on the basis of Mark.

As to the Genealogy, Lk. 3 23–38, little can be said. The editorial phrase, *ὡς ἐνομίζετο,* reveals the use of a source whose point of view Luke realizes to be different from his own, and which he seems, furthermore, to be somewhat reluctant to insert. The explanation would be that Luke found the genealogy in his principal source at just this point. Again, the reference to Adam as "son of God" in v. 38, may be compared with the naming of God as "our Father" (11 2) or "your Father" (6 36; 11 13; 12 30, 32), and the mention of men as "sons of the Highest" (6 35) and "sons of God" (20 36),—it will be noted that all but the last of these references are to Q passages. Matthew, of course, preferred his own more pretentious and better schematized version of the genealogy.

Thus, a review of the material, in detail, confirms the hypothesis that the entire block, Lk. 3 1–4 30, may reasonably be referred to the use of a single source, with editorial improvements and reminiscences of Mark.

4. With Lk. 5 1–11 the case is different. The marks of "Lukan" vocabulary[7] are more numerous than in any previous section of these materials, except the clearly editorial 3 21–22; and to those listed by Hawkins others might be added, e. g., *θάμβος περιέσχεν αὐτὸν* (v. 9, cf. 4 36). Here, too, the emphasis

[6] Harnack, *op. cit.*, pp. 310–314; Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

[7] Hawkins, *loc. cit.*

upon the prophetic side of Jesus' ministry which all the preceding sections have sustained (save in John's mistaken view) is wanting, and Jesus appears primarily as a miracle worker: the effect of his discourse is unnoticed, it takes a miracle to get results!

This, together with the fact that this narrative is interpolated as an *independent* block, in no wise connected with the preceding, indicates that this section does not belong to the source of 3 1–4 30, nor indeed even to Proto-Luke; but that it is an independent insertion in the final compilation of the gospel. The presence of non-Lukan words and of Semitisms, however, is to be noted,[8] so that some independent source is perhaps to be premised.

Lk. 5 36, 39 may be similar independent insertions by the evangelist, perhaps on the basis of oral tradition. Lk. 5 36, in particular, shows strong coloring of "Lukan" vocabulary; but there is no reason for connecting any of this material with the Common Source.

5. The problem of the Great Sermon (Lk. 6 20–49) and of its relation to the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew is notoriously difficult. Full treatment of it must be postponed: yet the corroboration of our premises in the preceding block will perhaps warrant us in assuming, with both President Burton and Canon Streeter,[9] that Luke's sermon is drawn *in extenso* from the common source. A few additional considerations may be noted:

a) There are two passages without Matthew parallels. The first of these, the Woes of Lk. 6 24–26, balances the Beatitudes of Luke too well to have been ever independent of them: if not editorial, it must come from the same source as the rest of the Sermon. Matthew's "spiritualization" of the Beatitudes shows clearly why he omitted these woes, which are, moreover, a particularization of the philippic of Lk. 3 7–9. The same exact balance appears in the other passage, Lk. 6 33–35 a, which must certainly form a literary unit with vv. 32, 35 b: v. 34 moreover

[8] Easton, B. S., *Gospel acc. to St. Luke*, pp. 60–62.

[9] Burton, *Some Principles of Literary Criticism and the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 44, 63; Streeter, *op. cit.*; see also Castor, G. D., *Matthew's Sayings of Jesus*, pp. 25–40.

has a definitely Palestinian setting, and could, therefore, hardly be attributed to the evangelist himself. We may accordingly affirm that the single tradition, at least, does not break the unity of the Sermon.

b) The general interest of the Common Source in a prophetic type of Messianic ministry is, of course, fully exemplified in such a discourse as this; and it receives specific attestation in 6 40, "a disciple not above his master." Lesser links between this section and the preceding block of the Common Source are found in the materialistic outlook of the eschatology (vv. 20–21, 24–25, cf. 3 9, 17), in the references to hunger (vv. 21, 25) which betray the perpetual interest of the peasant class (cf. 4 3–4), in the reference to the giving up of the *chiton* (v. 29, cf. 3 11, though the point of the illustration is different), in that to men as "sons of God" (vv. 35–36, see above on 3 38) and to "tree" and "good fruit" (v. 43, cf. 3 7–9), and in the strong ethical insistence (esp. v. 38, "with what measure ye mete," cf. 3 10–14).

c) It may be objected that the filling of the hungry promised in the beatitude (v. 21) is just what is rejected in the first temptation (4 3–4). It will be noted, however, quite aside from any Hebraistic and metaphorical use of the terms "hungry," etc., that the two passages are agreed in postponing the fulfilment of the eschatological program to a later date, and in interpreting the function of Jesus' earthly ministry as prophetic. And it will be recalled that this is exactly the movement of early Christian apologetic thought as reflected in the primitive sources of Acts. That the eschatology of John should look to the immediate coming of the Messiah where Christian thought had learned to look for a Second Coming, or that his ethical teaching should be more practical and less idealistic, need occasion no difficulty, if any historical contact with the tradition of the Baptist be allowed.

d) It would appear, from the agreement of Matthew with Luke in the position of the Sermon, that some setting for it was found in the Source. This may well have been, as Streeter supposes,[10] the list of the Chosen Twelve. In this list, moreover,

[10] *ibid.*, pp. 214–215.

Matthew and Luke agree in joining the names of Simon and Andrew, — which *may* indicate again a difference in source from Lk. 5 1–11, where Andrew is omitted and Simon is brought into conjunction with James and John, as in Mark's list. This being the case, this list would be the *first* narrative, in the Common Source, of the call of disciples.

6. The Healing of the Centurion's Servant, Lk. 7 1–10, must have stood in the Common Source, else Luke and Matthew would hardly have agreed in its location. As Castor remarks, "It is hard to doubt that wherever Luke and Matthew found this narrative of healing, they also found just before it a discourse of Jesus beginning with the Beatitudes and closing with the parable of the Two Builders."[11] Adding to this the evidence of close agreement in language, Lk. 7 7–9, there can be no doubt of a common source, nor, indeed of the Common Source of the preceding sections. The opening scene, also, in which a Gentile is represented as unworthy to approach Jesus, could hardly have been composed by the evangelist; but it does accord with the generally Palestinian outlook of the Common Source (to which Lk. 4 25–27 is no exception, as we have seen). Matthew may well have omitted these verses in his customary compression of narrative.

It should be noted that the "prophetic" Christology is still apparent in this section. Although there is a healing miracle, the interest is not centered upon it and the result is told only in an editorial afterthought, while the chief point of the story is in the faith manifested by the centurion, which is regarded as the more remarkable since its possessor is a Gentile.

7. Even in the Healing at Nain, Lk. 7 11–17, the prophetic element is not entirely lost; for the miracle is ascribed by the people to God (cf. 11 20), and Jesus is hailed as a great prophet in language reminiscent of the hymns in the first chapter of the gospel. Attribution to a source, however, is somewhat problematical. On the one hand there are coincidences with the Common Source, especially with 4 16–30:—the parallel to Elijah's miracle for the widow of Sarepta (cf. Lk. 4 25), the use of Old Testament

[11] Castor, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

language (v. 15 b), and the Hebraistic quality of the style.[12] On the other hand, marks of "Lukan" style are rather numerous, eleven in the seven verses (though six of these are designated by Easton as characteristic of the Source L). The narrative may be provisionally assigned to the Common Source, since it stands in a block with materials from that source. Matthew has broken with the order of the Source at this point and in so doing omitted the section, either by accident, or as being an unnecessary duplication of the Raising of Jairus' Daughter, to which he has given a somewhat similar position.[13]

8. The Place of John the Baptist, Lk. 7 18–35. This section is regularly assigned to Q. Four verses, however, are peculiar to Luke: vv. 20–21, 29–30. The former are probably an editorial summary: the latter may be editorial, also; but it should be noted that Wellhausen and Streeter, followed by Easton,[14] all assign them to Q, and that they refer back definitely to 3 10–14. The peculiar vocabulary of Luke, however, is prominent.

The section as a whole relates closely to the previous account of John the Baptist. He is here introduced as well known and honored, but it is again affirmed that Jesus is greater (7 28 b, cf. 3 15–17). The query which John puts (v. 19) is entirely natural in view of the contradiction between his own expectation of a Messianic Judgement (3 9, 17) and the prophetic program of Jesus' actual ministry (cf. 4 1–30, and the discussion above). The answer to his question gives an explicit resolution of the problem, by reference to two messianic prophecies from Isaiah, the first of which makes contact with John's point of view and corrects it, while the second is that already quoted in Jesus' own announcement of his program (cf. 4 18–19). A further link with previous sections is found in the manner in which the Old Testament quotation is employed in v. 27.

9. The section on the Anointing of Jesus, Lk. 7 36–50, again, is difficult to assign with certainty. Wellhausen had already analysed it into constituent pericopes; but the com-

12 Easton, *Luke*, p. 98.

13 Parsons, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

14 Wellhausen, J., *Lukasevangelium*, S. 30; Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 291; Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

bination of these can hardly have been the work of the evangelist; for marks of his own style are relatively few. Some of the characteristics of the common source appear. There is a polemic against the wealthy Pharisee (vv. 44–46) much milder than the Woes upon the Rich (6 24–26); there is an interest in loans (v. 41, cf. 6 34; Mt. 5 42), and in sinners (vv. 37, 39, cf. 6 32–34, etc.,—only here is the woman a "sinner"), and Jesus is regarded as a prophet (v. 39, cf. esp. 7 16). Only in non-Markan sections of Luke is Jesus represented as being on friendly terms with Pharisees, though perhaps patronized (v. 36, cf. 11 37; 14 1, etc.).

The ideas of the forgiveness of sins and of the saving quality of faith, which appear in the second conclusion (vv. 48–50) are, however, new to the Common Source, and a closer inspection shows that they may well be of Markan derivation, here. Indeed, "Lukan" characteristics are more numerous in these verses, and they would appear to be an editorial addition based upon Mk. 2 5–7 (= Lk. 5 20–21) and Mk. 5 34 (= Lk. 8 48), where the same words are addressed again to a *woman*. Other Mark contacts are confined to a few words in the introductory verses (vv. 37–38) and the name, "Simon." Apart from vv. 48–50, then, this section might be attributed to the Common Source. Matthew's omission of it could be laid to his usual preference for the shorter version in narrative.

10. Lk. 8 1–3 is a generalized summary of Jesus' activity, and contains numerous "Lukan" characteristics. It is probably editorial in its present form. The list of names, however, like that of 6 13–16, differs from any Markan list, and it is reasonable to suppose that the section is based upon some non-Markan tradition. There are contacts, also, with later sections of the Common Source; but attribution to it, though probable, cannot be made with certainty.

The result of the foregoing review of the materials has been to confirm the hypothesis of President Burton with which we started,—that the non-Markan materials of Luke 3 1–8 3 are in the main derivable from a single source. It has been shown that the two blocks of material, Lk. 3 1–4 30 and 6 20–7 50

are so similar in general viewpoint and character and so linked with one another, that with due allowance for editorial additions and modifications derivation from a single source is probable. The editorial sections 6 12–19 and 8 1–3 seem also to adhere to the second block. The narrative of the Call of Simon, Lk. 5 1–11, however, seems to bear another character, and, moreover, it stands alone in the midst of Markan materials; it has therefore been excluded from the present list. A few other scattered verses in Markan material, Lk. 5 33, 36; 9 31–32, cannot be allocated. Local coloring is largely lacking in the source; but it will be convenient to retain the designation "G," or "Galilean," given by Dr. Burton, as its few geographical hints (aside from the Baptism and Temptation narratives) seem to be Galilean,—Nazareth (4 16), Nain (7 11), Capernaum (7 1), and the Galilean women, Mary of Magdala and Joanna (of Tiberias?, 8 2–3).

Attention should again be called to the fact that in these two blocks Matthew and Luke agree in the order of the sections:—

1. The Preaching of John	Lk. 3 1–20 =	Mt. 3 7–10, 12
2. (The Baptism of Jesus)	3 21–22	
3. The Genealogy of Jesus	3 23–38	
4. The Temptation	4 1–13 =	4 2–11
5. (Jesus' Return to Galilee)	4 14–15 =	4 23
6. The Rejection at Nazareth	4 16–30	
7. (The Hearers of the Sermon)	6 12–19	cf. 4 24–25
8. The Beatitudes	6 20–26 =	5 2–12
9. On the Law of Love	6 27–36 =	5 39–48, 7 12
10. On Judging	6 37–42 =	7 1–5, etc.
11. On Doing Righteousness	6 43–49 =	7 16–27, 12 35
12. Healing of the Centurion's Boy	7 1–10 =	8 5–13
13. Raising of the Widow's Son	7 11–17	
14. On John the Baptist	7 18–35 =	11 2–19
15. Jesus Anointed	7 36–50	
16. (The Companions of Jesus)	8 1–3	

It will be noted that in all this material there are only four verses whose Matthew parallels stand outside the limits of the corresponding section (Mt. 7 12, 10 24; 12 35; 15 14), and these

are all brief sayings, easily transposed. In addition there is some confusion *within* the section, especially section 9, which seems to argue conflation with another source by Matthew (so Streeter, p. 252). It should also be noted that Matthew has likewise removed section 14 from its original proximity to section 12, in order not to interrupt his collection of ten great miracles in chapters 8 and 9.

Slight evidence is also to be found for Matthew's knowledge of some of the omitted sections. It has already been noted that Mt. 4 13 has contacts with section 6. Section 13, which would have found a place in Mt. 8–9 has been omitted in favor of the Raising of Jairus' Daughter, which is brought forward to a much earlier position than in Mark; but the concluding sentence (Lk. 7 17) is closely paralleled in the editorial conclusion which Matthew has added to his Markan material. Section 15 also finds parallels to its foremost themes, — "Her sins are forgiven" (vv. 47–48), and "Thy faith hath made thee whole" (v. 50), — in other incidents of this same chapter in Matthew. Even section 16, though largely editorial, seems to have caused the insertion *τὰς πόλεις πάσας καὶ τὰς κώμας* in Mt. 9 35 (which in other respects is identical with Mt. 4 23), and it *may* also be reflected in the editorial introduction and conclusion of the transposed section 14 (Mt. 11 1, 20: *κηρύσσειν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν, τὰς πόλεις*).

Too much weight cannot, of course, be attached to these last hints; but at least it may be assumed as established that in the two blocks of material, Lk. 3 1–4 30; 6 12 (or 20)–8 3, Luke is reproducing nearly in full and in its original order a source which was largely excerpted by Matthew, in his chapters 3 to 8; though there are a few scattered verses to which Matthew has given new contexts, and one section which he has removed bodily to chapter 11.

II

The next step in this study we owe to Canon Streeter's observation that in the Great Interpolation of Luke the use of sources in blocks is still apparent, and to his further observation (partly anticipated by Harnack and others) that for a part of

this material Luke and Matthew still preserve a common order. This raises two questions: Ought any of these blocks to be added to the "G" source? Can we by so doing reduce the number of common sources?

It must first be observed that Burton, assuming that the other sources were interpolated into Mark, was compelled to make his blocks coterminous with the non-Markan sections. Upon the Proto-Luke hypothesis this restriction vanishes; if Proto-Luke existed as an independent work, then Mark might easily be interpolated into it without regard to the sutures of its earlier sources.

Since it was Matthew's agreement with the Lukan order which served to confirm our previous conclusion regarding the unity of the G source, the first inquiry must be, In what further sections of this material do Matthew and Luke agree in order? These may be listed as follows, as they are described by Canon Streeter (pp. 273–274):—

"Block I":	a)	Lk.	9 56–60 =	Mt.	8 19–22
	b)		10 2–3 =		9 37–38, 10 16
	c)		10 4–12 =		10 7–15, rearranged.
	d)		10 13–15 =		11 20–23
	e)		10 21–22 =		11 25–27
"Block II":	f)		11 14–23 =		12 22–30
	g)		11 24–26 =		12 43–45 } (these two
	h)		11 29–32 =		12 38–42 } reversed).

Here are 38 verses, at a minimum, in which a common order can be traced, and not more than 15 verses in this section of Luke can be paralleled elsewhere in Matthew. Moreover, this series of agreements follows immediately upon the G series in Matthew, allowing for the transposition of section 14 (Mt. 11 2–10). A further series of agreements has been noted by Harnack (p. 177), including the following:

i)	Lk.	11 39–52 =	Mt.	23 4–36, rearranged.
j)		12 39–46 =		24 43–51
k)		[13 34–35 =		23 37–39]
l)		17 20–37 =		24 17–41, rearranged.
m)		19 24–26 =		25 28–29.

This series, however, is so broken, and the Matthaean parallels are located so far from the corresponding Lukan position, and indeed from the earlier Matthew sections, that they cannot be grouped with the first list (a–h) without some further reasons. We may proceed, therefore, to a study of the block of material, Lk. 9 51–11 32, examining first the homogeneity of the sections listed above (a–h) with the G source, and then the relation of the intervening sections peculiar to Luke.

i) Block I, Lk. 9 57–10 24.

1) Section "a", on the Unwilling Disciples, Lk. 9 57–62, recounts three instances, two of which were evidently in Q (= Mt. 8 19–22). Their relation to G is uncertain; but the interest in the poor, and particularly in the poverty of Jesus should be noted (v. 58, cf. 6 20–21; 4 3–4). The phrase "birds of the heavens" (v. 58) is used by Matthew in Q material of the Great Sermon (Mt. 6 26), and in other Q material by Luke (13 19), but it appears elsewhere in Luke as well (8 5). It will be observed that this section connects well with Section 17 (Lk. 8 1–3), which names some of the disciples who traveled with Jesus.

9 61–62 stand in the same relation to their context as do 6 33–34, or as the Woes to the Beatitudes (6 20–27):—they cannot be independent. Either they stood in the Source, or the evangelist himself has here formed an "apophthegma" from some fugitive "logion." But G has several groups of three (e. g.: 3 10–14; 4 3–12; 6 20–21, 32–34); and the allusion to Elijah and Elisha (v. 61 b cf. 1 Kings 19 20), while not sufficient to have produced the logion of v. 62, does accord with the interest of G in these prophets (cf. 4 25–27; 7 15). These verses, then, may be included with the rest of the section in G. Matthew would have omitted them because a legalistic interpretation would seem to exclude any possibility of repentance or forgiveness for sins committed after baptism,—least of all, any hope for the "lapsed."

2) The Commission of the Seventy, Lk. 10 1–12 (sec. "b" and "c"), is conflated with Markan materials by Matthew in his Missionary Discourse (Mt. 9 37–10 16), which accounts for

the free handling of the material, in the way of minor omissions and of rearrangement. Lk. 10 1 may be editorial; but vv. 8–9, though very freely treated by Matthew, are a part of the section. Several hints in the discourse show the viewpoint of G. The "prophetic" conception of Jesus appears not only in the anticipation that he himself will follow up the preaching of the Seventy (v. 1), but in the content of their message (vv. 9, 11, cf. 4 21; 6 20; 9 60). This excludes an interest in the miraculous,—even in v. 9 θεραπεύετε is probably to be taken in its more usual sense of "care for (the sick)" (cf. Moulton-Milligan, *Vocab.*, *s. v.*). Interest in the poor appears in the direction to the missionaries to maintain even the outward semblance of poverty, "no purse, nor even sandals" (v. 4). There may be, also, an allusion to Elisha, again, in the injunction against salutations (v. 4, cf. 2 Ki. 4 29, see above on 9 61). There is no reason for refusing to assign this to G. If the number seventy be historical, the population of Galilee (Josephus, *Life*, 45, says there were 204 cities and villages) would warrant such a mission (and cf. Mt. 10 23).

3. The Woes upon the Cities, Lk. 10 13–15 (section "d") is appended by Matthew to the end of Section 14,—i. e., at the next available location. Assignment to G is not so clear. The cities named are Galilean, and the reference to Tyre and Sidon recalls that of 4 26; but emphasis on miracles is strange in G, except as signs *to the Gentiles* (so here?). This section, therefore, cannot by itself be assigned to G, but it will go with the block in which it stands.

4. The obscure Confession of Jesus, Lk 10 21–22 (sec. "e"), which follows closely in both Matthew and Luke, shows G's interest in the lowly. Its Christology is obscure. Harnack,[15] after a careful study of the textual evidence omits the words, τίς ἐστιν ὁ Υἱός . . . and so reaches an "ethical" relationship of Jesus to the Father. Easton[16] reviewing Harnack's evidence, omits the alternate clause, τίς ἐστιν ὁ Πατήρ . . . and interprets of the secret of the (prophetic) character of the Messianic

[15] Harnack, *op. cit.*, pp. 272–310.
[16] Easton, *op. cit.*, pp. 164–165 n., 166–168.

mission. Either of these would be possible for G, the latter especially.

It would appear, therefore, that the common materials of Block I show such homogeneity that they may be assumed to have come from a single source, and that source was G. Can we assign the peculiar materials of Luke also to the same source?

5. The Inhospitable Samaritans, Lk. 9 51–56, does not interrupt the connection of 8 3 and 9 57; but, rather, the mention of a journey in 8 1 leads up to the journey here described, as noted by Easton.[17] Verse 51, with many "Lukan characteristics" may be editorial. There are some definite G characteristics in the section,—it inculcates non-resistance (v. 55, cf. 6 29–30); it shows again an interest in Elijah (v. 54, and explicit in the Received Text, cf. on 9 61); and it mentions non-Jews without much prejudice, but also without favor (cf. 4 25–27). Matthew naturally omits it, because it puts the disciples in an unfavorable light. We may therefore assign it, with its context, to G.

6. The Return of the Missionaries, Lk. 10 17–20, exhibits the interests of G, also. The central interest here seems to lie in the success of the prophetic side of the Messianic program, which is said to have brought Satan low already (v. 17). As a result of this latter fact the Christian is (unexpectedly) able to exorcise or even to "tread on serpents" in the Name of his Lord (vv. 17, 19); but these features are regarded as purely incidental, as elsewhere in G (v. 20). The section, moreover, fills a place in the ascending interest of a group of narratives:—the mission of the Seventy (vv. 1–12), the condemnation of the cities that reject them (vv. 13–15), their return (vv. 17–20), Jesus' joy over the faith of the lowly (vv. 21–22), and the final commendation of the missionaries (vv. 23–24). Matthew, who looked for a future fall of Satan, would quite naturally have passed over these words.

Lk. 10 16 may have a literary relationship to Mt. 10 40, which is in the same general context; but the parallel is not

[17] *ibid.*, p. 152.

beyond the limits of oral tradition of such an epigram as this. The "prophetic" interest of the Lukan version should be noted, in the use of the verb ἀκούω to describe the disciple.

Lk. 10 23–24 continues the thought of v. 18, and shows again G's interest in the humble and lowly, here contrasted with prophets and kings (v. 24). In its Lukan location it forms an effective climax to the preceding narrative; Matthew however has transferred it (as he did some short sayings from the Great Sermon, cf. Lk. 6 31, 39, 40, 45) to a context where it has much less force. It may be assumed, therefore, to belong to the block.

Thus it is apparent that not only do 9 51–10 24 form a single block of materials, as Canon Streeter holds, but that the block is a continuation of the G source.

ii) Block II, Lk. 11 9–12 10. It has already been noted that only in the first part of this block (11 14–32) do Matthew and Luke have a common order. We must therefore examine this portion first, together with the materials intervening between the two blocks.

7. The Beelzebul incident, Lk. 11 14–23 (sec. "f"), is now generally agreed to have stood in Q as well as in Mark.[18] Luke here gives the non-Markan version, and Matthew follows this, in the main, for both location and language, though as usual he conflates more or less with Mark, and prefers the Markan version of the saying about the "strong man armed." The section shows the viewpoint of G in its dislike of exorcism. The demand for a sign appears as a temptation (v. 16, cf. 4 9–12); the exorcism, however, is not a sign, but is merely on a plane with that of numerous Jewish exorcists (v. 19),—in any case the power is that of God, not inherent in Jesus himself (v. 20, cf. 7 16), which accords with the "prophetic" conception of Jesus.

8. The section ("g") on the Return of the Demon (Lk. 11 24–26) appears in Matthew in a different context, but it is quite apt at this point. Its attitude is the same, with apparently a sarcastic contempt for the results of exorcism.

[18] Hawkins, J. C., in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 45–49.

9. The Sign of Jonah, Lk. 11 29–32 (sec. "h"), appears in the same context in Matthew, but just *before* section "g." It connects well with the demand for a sign above (v. 16,—hence Matthew's change of order), and its thought is still consonant with that of G. Here, too, Jesus is compared with a prophet, either as to his preaching function or as the herald of God's judgement, and with Solomon as a teacher,—a Christology so primitive that Matthew has naturally changed the point of the "sign of Jonah," adding the reference to three days. Here also there is a reference to the books of Kings, though not indeed to the Elijah-Elisha stories.

10. The Great Commandment, Lk. 10 25–28, has no immediate parallel in Matthew, and differs in several respects from the corresponding Markan account, with which it has little in common except the Old Testament quotations. Matthew, however, though he follows the Mark account in the main has added to it a number of significant touches common to Luke,—*νομικός, πειράζων, διδάσκαλε, ἐν τῷ νόμῳ,* and the instrumental *ἐν* in the quotation. This would seem to indicate a common source, although v. 25 has certainly no immediate connection with the preceding section of Luke. There are, however, contacts with G, in the Old Testament quotation, in the acceptance of the Old Testament as containing the rule of life, and in the designation of Jesus as "teacher" (v. 25).

11. The Parable of the Good Samaritan, Lk. 10 29–37, however, does not connect closely with the preceding section. The question by which the two are linked, "Who is my neighbor?" (v. 29) seems to require the answer, "The man in need," but this is not the answer given (v. 37). Had the parable stood in any common source, moreover, it is difficult to account for its omission by Matthew, who twice of his own accord has added the words of Hosea, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice" (Mt. 9 13; 12 7). The Judean setting (v. 30), with its reference to priest and Levite, and the choice of a Samaritan for especially favorable mention, are not characteristics of G. This parable, then, must have come from some other source.

12. Mary and Martha, Lk. 10 38–42, also has few signs of derivation from G. The attitude toward good living seems

rather to reflect an ascetic interest than a recognition of the mere fact that the followers of Christ *are* poor, such as G manifests. It is possible, also, if the Johannine identification of Mary and Martha with Bethany has some foundation, that this also, like the preceding, is a Judean tradition.

13. The Lord's Prayer, Lk. 11 1–4, appears in a version differing very considerably from that in Matthew, and Canon Streeter has reviewed the reasons for assigning it to a different source.[19] As a matter of fact, there is no reason to look for documentary relationship here; for liturgical use must have preserved independent versions of such a passage as this, as it still does (cf. "debts" and "trespasses"). Luke's version may be that of G; for the simple "Father" (which Matthew greatly modifies by adding "in the heavens") fits G's description of men as "sons of the Highest" (6 35, 36), and the prayer for "bread for today" seems to reflect the conditions of the very poor as do other sections of G.

The introductory verse (v. 1) must be partly editorial; but the comparison of Jesus with John the Baptist could hardly have been added by the evangelist, and it is in the manner of G (but the only other reference to John's *prayers* is an editorial addition by Luke to the Markan narrative, Lk. 5 33). It should be noted that the section Lk. 11 1–13 forms a clearly defined block on the single subject of prayer,—first a form of prayer (vv. 2–4), then a parable on persistence in prayer (vv. 5–8), with its application (vv. 9–13),—and that the last was known to Matthew also. It is reasonable to suppose, therefore, that he knew all three. He would most certainly have preferred the version of the Lord's Prayer which was familiar to him in liturgical use.

14. The parable of the Friend at Midnight, Lk. 11 5–8, must have stood in the source immediately preceding the injunction to "knock" (v. 9), which is unintelligible without it. Matthew had reason enough to omit it: a parable would have seriously interrupted the Sermon on the Mount, the thought of this one seemed at variance with the warning against "vain

[19] Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 275–278.

repetitions" (Mt. 6 7–8), and he may have felt the humor irreverent. But the parable fairly reeks of the life of the Palestinian peasant, which is so frequently the background of G.

15. The section On Asking and Seeking, Lk. 11 9–13, has been transferred by Matthew to a much earlier context, in the Sermon on the Mount; and this is the largest block of G anywhere so transferred. A common source, however, is unquestionable, for the agreement is unusually close; and the passage must be assigned to G in spite of the difference in order. Lk. vv. 11–12 gives a different pair of figures from those in Matthew: it seems probable that G (which has triplets elsewhere,—v. 9, and see on 9 61) had a triple comparison here also, from which Matthew has omitted the egg and scorpion, Luke the bread and stone. The latter item is reminiscent of the First Temptation (4 3–4), another G link. It should be noted that the reference to the Holy Spirit as given in answer to prayer is very primitive (v. 13),[20] but accords well with the "Western" reading preferred by Canon Streeter in v. 2 above. The reference to the "Father *from* heaven" is likewise more primitive than Matthew's corresponding phrase, and is again reminiscent (like v. 2) of G.

16. The Cry of the Woman, Lk. 11 27–28, seriously interrupts the G context in which it stands, where v. 29 takes up the demand of v. 16; Prof. Easton's connection of these verses with 10 42 is quite apt. They *may,* however, have stood in G, since even here the emphasis is thrown upon "hearing the word" (cf. 6 43–49), and unique honor for Jesus is apparently disclaimed. The latter would account for Matthew's omission.

It is now apparent that the two blocks of material, Luke 9 51–10 24, and 11 1–32 are to be assigned to a common source, which must further be identified with the G source of Luke's earlier interpolations. The intervening materials, Lk. 10 25–42, with the possible exception of vv. 25–28, cannot be assigned to G, but are, like Lk. 5 1–11, an interpolated block. The same

[20] Cf. Parsons, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

is true of the rest of the Great Interpolation of Luke: beyond Lk. 11 32 there is no material which can be assigned to the Galilean Source with any certainty. In these chapters the amount of material common to Matthew and Luke is not large (some 75 verses only), and the character of most of it is quite different. It seems hardly probable that G would have had even the eschatology of such sections as Lk. 12 49–59 and 17 20–37. This does, it is true, leave G without a fitting conclusion; but the existing Mark and Acts warn us not expect too much of an earlier source.

III

The passages thus far assigned to the G source consist of the four blocks of material, Luke 3 1–4 30; 6 20–8 3; 9 51–10 24; 11 1–32. It is possible that 6 12–16 (17–19) and 10 25–28 should also be added. The blocks contain, of course, more or less of editorial redaction, especially where the G source may have run parallel with Mark or some other document.

It will be noted at once that the G document combines a considerable amount of narrative with discourse materials. Thus, there are six narrative sections, and 11 sections of narrative with dialogue, as against only six of the latter only, in the remainder of the Great Interpolation of Luke; while G has but 5 sections of pure discourse and 9 of discourse with narrative setting, as against 7 and 16 respectively in the rest of the Great Interpolation. However, of the thirteen parables in the Great Interpolation, G contains only one, that of the Friend at Midnight.[21]

G's feeling for form is notable. It appears sometimes in the exact balancing of sentences, or even paragraphs,—as in the Beatitudes and Woes (6 20–26), the miracles of Elijah and Elisha (4 25–27), the chiastic order of the Baptist's announcement (3 16), and perhaps in the pairing of the disciples

[21] Bultmann's classification (*op. cit.*) shows the same features;—of the G materials he classifies 4 sections as pure narratives, 6 as apophthegmata, and 47 as sayings; while for the rest of the Great Interpolation the figures are 0, 10, 79.

in the list of 6 14–16. Most notable, however, are the triads of events or statements, which are numerous in this source,—three temptations (4 3–12), three classes moved by John's preaching (3 10–14), three short Beatitudes and three short woes (6 20–21, 24–25), three comparisons with the "sinners" (6 32–34), three unwilling disciples (9 57–62), and perhaps three short parables (11 11–12, TR, cf. Mt. 7 9). In all of these groups, it will be noted, the three members have very great similarity, if not identity, of structure.

A further formal characteristic is the use of quotations, often extensive, from the Old Testament,—in which respect this source stands second only to Matthew's gospel. Full quotation is found at 3 4–6; 4 18–19; 7 27 and 10 27; briefer reminiscences occupy prominent positions in 4 4–12; 7 22; 9 54; 10 15,—and the majority of these quotations are introduced formally with a skillfully inserted γέγραπται. There are few evidences of a peculiar vocabulary; though it may be noted that the verb ἀγαπάω occurs 7 times in four different sections of this source and only twice elsewhere in Luke.

The Christology of the source is that of the early chapters of Acts, with minor differences. Jesus is represented as rejecting the popular Messianic ideals (4 3–12, cf. 10 17–20; 11 27–28) held even by John the Baptist (3 9, 17; 7 19), and as choosing the *preaching* of the Kingdom, both personally (4 18–19, 21; 7 22; 9 60; 11 30, cf. 10 1) and through his disciples (9 60; 10 9, 11). In connection with this program he also appears as a teacher (6 20–49; 6 40; 10 16; 11 28, 31), and emphasis is placed upon "hearing" him (but cf. 6 46). Jesus is described as "son of God" (3 22; 4 3, 9; 10 22 *tris*,—half of the occurrences of this title in Luke), or as "son of Man" (6 22; 7 34; 9 58; 11 30) with about equal frequency; but the former term should be interpreted in the light of G's tendency to describe men also as "sons of God" (3 38; 6 35, 36; 11 2, 13,—also in 12 30, 32; 20 36 only).

The most definite title, however, which G gives to Jesus is that of "prophet" (7 16, 39, cf. 10 21–22) which is implicit in many passages. In particular, a parallel is often drawn between the work of Jesus and that of the great legendary prophets.

Comparisons with Elijah and Elisha are drawn explicitly (in 4 25–27 and in 9 54, TR), and are pointed by allusion and reminiscence in other passages (7 12, 15; 9 54, 61; 10 4); and this characteristic is the more significant because so accidental: there are, however, only three other references to the Elijah-Elisha stories in the whole of Luke (9 17; 19 41; 22 43).[22] This interest in the narratives *about* the prophets, rather than in their actual words, appears again in the use of Jonah (11 30), and in the interest in John the Baptist (which is considerable, in this source cf. 3 3–18; 7 18–35), and in the comparison of Jesus and John (3 9, 15–17; 7 28; 11 1).

In conformity with the "prophetic" Christology there is also a depreciation of miracles and exorcism. Jesus refuses to use miracles as "signs" or to make them the basis of his ministry (4 9–12, 25–27; 11 16, 29–32), though it is apparently granted that they might be used as signs to the Gentiles (4 25–27; 10 13–15). Elsewhere the supernatural power is ascribed directly to God (7 16; 11 20) and the value of miracles is minimized in various ways (7 1–10; 10 9, 18–20; 11 16–19, 24–26).

The source shows little interest in eschatology or apocalyptic. A future judgment is expected (6 20–26, cf. 3 9, 17; 10 12–15) but there is no particularization of its details. The term "Kingdom of God" is never used in a definitely eschatological sense. The Kingdom is "preached" (8 1; 9 60), it is nigh or already possessed (6 20; 10 9, 11; 11 20), or it is mentioned more vaguely (7 28; 9 62; 11 2); but the concept is in marked contrast with the generally eschatological connotation of the term in the rest of the Great Interpolation. And the ethical emphasis is not upon the passive virtues most often associated with apocalyptic teaching,—watchfulness, trust, faith, patience,—but upon the active principles of love (6 27–35; 7 47; 10 25–27), even to the point of non-resistance (6 29–30; 9 55; 10 3, 11), and upon righteous conduct (3 10–14; 6 39–49; 10 28); and even faith and prayer become active and strenuous virtues in these sections (7 8–10; 11 5–10).

[22] According to the excellent marginal references in the Bible Society's edition of Nestle's text.

As to social relations, there is a prominent interest in the poor, or rather, the source itself speaks with the very voice of the poor. It is the poor who are evangelized (3 10–14; 4 18; 7 22; 10 21–22, 23–24). Hunger and privation are ever-present *facts* in the thought of these sections (6 21, 25; 3 11; 4 3–4; 9 58; 11 3, 5–8, 11 TR), and they have no ascetic halo about them! The poor man's single shirt appears in parable and teaching (3 11; 6 29–30), and the missionaries are warned to present themselves as beggars (10 4) that they may share in the meagre gifts of the poor (10 7–8). Class consciousness is apparent occasionally (6 24–26; 7 44–46), and the interest in loans may also be significant (6 34; 7 41, cf. Mt. 5 42; the verb δανίζεσθαι appears only here). There is also a certain interest in the "sinners," so-called (3 8–10; 6 32–34; 7 37, 39, 47), and in other unfortunates (4 18; 7 22).

Finally, the exclusively Palestinian outlook of the source must be mentioned. The Old Testament seems to be still the ultimate religious authority (4 4–12; 10 26) as well as the witness to Jesus' person (4 21, etc.). Gentiles and Samaritans are rarely mentioned, and only with a certain condescension, though without a Pharisaic hostility (4 25–27; 7 3–5; 9 51–56; 10 13–15; 11 30, 32).

This latter characteristic is one of the few clues to the date and provenance of the document. With its primitive Christology, and the reflection of a community of the very poor, it seems to have come from a situation when the Gentile controversy had not become sufficiently acute to arouse within the Christian church the old Jewish prejudices and to cause bitterness and strife in the church. If that be true, the date would have to be placed later than the first conversions of Samaritans and Gentiles, but earlier than Galatians. As to provenance, although a Jerusalem origin is the natural hypothesis, there is nothing to suggest association with that city; and it *may* be that not only the scene but the origin of the source are to be found in Galilee.

THE VOICE FROM THE WHIRLWIND

MILLAR BURROWS
BROWN UNIVERSITY

THE purpose of this paper is to review some of the most important theories which have been advanced within the present decade regarding the Theophany in Job 38–42.[1] All commentators recognize that these chapters present a difficult problem. Job has indignantly repudiated the interpretation which his friends put upon his sufferings and has turned from them to the very God whom he holds responsible for his undeserved affliction; but God appears only to silence him with ironic questions, vouchsafing no explanation of his torment, and draws from him a confession of error, then paradoxically condemns the three friends, declares that Job is in the right, and restores him to health and prosperity. That the difficulty is a real one is shown by the number of solutions which commentators have felt called upon to offer. The same consideration should also serve to warn us against accepting any theory too readily.

It is neither feasible nor necessary to discuss in this connection the critical questions involved in other portions of the book. For our present purpose we may assume that the Prologue was a part of the original work. We may also assume that chapter 28 and the Elihu speeches are later additions. In

[1] The commentators to whom I shall refer particularly are Jastrow (1920), Driver and Gray (I. C. C., 1921), Ball (1922), Buttenwieser (1922), and Fullerton (*ZATW* 1924, pp. 116–136). I have been unable to secure the commentaries of Volz (1921) and Steuernagel (1923) in time for the preparation of this paper.

fact within the chapters with which we are particularly concerned we may admit without argument that 40 15–41, the behemoth-leviathan section, is probably secondary.

Having thus agreed that the book as we have it is not a unit, we are bound to confess that the most obvious way out of our difficulty with regard to the Yahweh speeches is to consider them the work of a later writer who did not sympathize with Job's bold indictment of God's justice. Several scholars have so considered them. If the chapters immediately preceding this section and nearly two chapters in the heart of it are admittedly secondary, the only question that remains is how much, if any, of the section is original. This is a matter of specific evidence.

Before examining the evidence in detail, however, we may ask whether it is probable that the book ever existed without a speech of Yahweh. If the Epilogue is retained, a divine address to Job is indispensable. Gray points out (I. C. C., p. lxii) that to remove the Yahweh speeches would leave Job's vindication in 42 7 clearer, but without the direct manifestation which Job desired; he would be answered only by the restoration of his fortunes, which he had not asked; and God would speak only to Eliphaz. The words addressed to Eliphaz in 42 7 clearly presuppose some reply to Job, though they do seem to imply a speech of commendation rather than one of rebuke.

Some scholars, however, reject the Epilogue as well as the Yahweh speeches. Jastrow (p. 67) sees in the last clause of 31 40—"The words of Job are ended"—evidence that the book once ended at that point.[2] But this statement may mean simply, "I have said all there is to say, and there is no use talking any more." In other words, the finality may be only in Job's mind: he does not expect God to take up his challenge immediately and enter into debate with him. Or the clause may be, as Gray thinks, an editorial note, inserted to mark the transition from the Dialogue to the Theophany or to the

[2] We are not here concerned with his theory that it originally ended with chapter 19.

Elihu speeches. However that may be, if there were no reply from God, Job's confidence in a divine vindication would be left hanging in the air. The reader would not know whether it was ever rewarded or not. This can hardly be called impossible, yet there is a dramatic fitness and impressiveness in having a Theophany here, and all Job's demands that he may speak with God face to face seem to point forward to it. It is more likely that the present speeches of Yahweh were substituted for something of a different tenor than that the book ever existed without any Theophany at all.

What reason have we, then, for rejecting these chapters? Some of the less important arguments may be considered first. Jastrow (p. 77) holds that the style here differs from that of the Dialogue even more than is the case in the Elihu speeches. Few would agree with him. Gray says (p. xlviii) that difference of style, "if it can be detected at all, does not extend beyond 40 6–41." Jastrow also maintains (p. 82) that the repetitions and abrupt transitions prove a separate origin for chapters 38–41, but this argument proves at most that not all of the section is original. More arresting is Jastrow's contention (p. 143) that these chapters were added after the Elihu speeches: (1) they make Elihu unnecessary, leaving no reason for the insertion of 32–36 in the body of the book; (2) there is a sharp demarcation between the trend of the Dialogue and that of chapters 38–41; and (3) (p. 144 n.) the phrase "out of the storm" in 38 1 assumes the existence of the Elihu speeches. These arguments are no more conclusive than the others. The Elihu speeches would have to be inserted before the theophany if anywhere. Perhaps the later poet, taking 38–42 as a condemnation of Job, felt that a stronger expression of the orthodox position was needed than the speeches of the friends provided; or perhaps, since there is a suspicion of satire in the speeches, he wished to expose the assurance of the younger generation as the preceding dialogue had exposed the complacency of the elder. In any case the purpose and thought of the Elihu speeches are not at all the same as those of the Theophany, and there is therefore no point in saying that the one makes the other unnecessary. Any view of the Elihu

speeches which can be held without the Yahweh speeches is equally tenable with them. The question of a difference in trend between the Dialogue and the Theophany is much more important and will be discussed separately. It does not apply particularly to the point now before us. As regards the implications of the phrase, "out of the storm," Jastrow is not consistent. In another connection (p. 79) he says that 36 24–37 13, 21–22 (the passages describing the storm) were inserted by some one who had 38–42 before him and with the purpose of paving the way for those chapters. In still another place (p. 83) he remarks that the words, "out of the storm" were interpolated because of the description of the storm in chapter 37. Doubtless the presence of such an inconsistency in Jastrow's commentary indicates composite authorship!

Others as well as Jastrow (p. 187) have pointed out that what Yahweh says to Job is anticipated in the earlier speeches of each of the three friends, of Elihu, and of Job himself, and that the manner and effect of God's appearance correspond to what Job in chapters 9–10 dreads and denounces as unfair rather than the meeting for which he expresses a longing in his later speeches. But is it necessary to assume that the poet would make God follow Job's directions? Job has claimed that if he could meet God on equal terms and with an umpire between them he could demonstrate his own righteousness and the injustice of his affliction. God does not grant him such a meeting, but does manage to convince him that he would not be quite such a formidable adversary to the Almighty in forensic debate as he seems to think. At the same time Yahweh does not at all "use his great power" against Job to overwhelm him nor let his terror appal him. The questions of 38–42 are very different from such a crushing as Job had complained of in 9 17. God simply convinces Job by the Socratic method, if you please, that he was mistaken in his denial of divine justice. And it is quite in keeping with the Socratic method not to tell Job anything he does not already know. It is a case of education in the literal sense of the term. Of course I do not mean that the poet deliberately wrote in this way for this reason, but the fact that he did so

write is no ground for objection to these chapters. Only in this way would it be possible for God to speak to a man through Nature. However much or little of the autobiographical element there may be in Job, I suspect that God had spoken through the wonders of Nature to the poet himself and had said just what he says in these speeches.

But, says Jastrow (p. 76), the problem of the book is not touched on: if these "nature poems" were not attached to the Book of Job no reader would ever associate them with the problem. They have "nothing at all" to do with Job's complaints (p. 86). Yet certainly no reader would ever suppose that these chapters were complete in themselves: the form of the questions and the ironic comments show clearly, at the least, that they are addressed to some one who has spoken or acted as though he knew a great deal more than he does. Here again Jastrow is not quite consistent. On the page following the statement just quoted he says (p. 87) that the purpose of these poems was to teach "humility in the face of the overpowering achievements of the Almighty." Has that nothing to do with Job's complaints and the problem of the book? In another place (p. 14) Jastrow himself says that these chapters suggest a definite and final answer to the problem.

It is true, of course, that no explanation of undeserved suffering is given in Yahweh's speeches. One reason which has been suggested is that the poet was not so much concerned with the discussion of a problem as with the portrayal of an experience. That he is interested in portraying experience and character is clear. Eliphaz and the rest are not mere caricatures: they express forcibly and beautifully beliefs with which the poet himself had little sympathy. To this extent the author was like those modern writers who insist that they do not seek to present a message but only to give a faithful picture of human life. He has also a poet's interest in words and phrases, not infrequently overpassing the bounds of dramatic probability to play with a thought and dress it in many colors. None the less he is also concerned, and deeply, with the problem which is raised by Job's experience, and he has convictions about it.

Some commentators hold that it was unnecessary to give a solution in the Yahweh speeches, because it had already been given in the first two chapters. What then is the significance of the Prologue in its relation to the Theophany? If the purpose of the whole book is to refute Satan's accusation, why are so many chapters of dialogue necessary, and how is the problem of suffering related to this purpose? Do Job's complaints merely show how sorely he has been tried and thus emphasize the genuineness of his piety, and are the charges of the friends merely the last refinement of the torture inflicted upon him? Buttenwieser (p. 41) sees a close connection between the Prologue and the doctrine of Job's three friends: the dogma of exact retribution had made piety a matter of mere policy, as the Satan claimed in Job's case. Hence the author's interest in establishing the possibility and reality of a different kind of piety, free from self-seeking. Surely it is not necessary thus to make the whole book a mere expansion of the Prologue. Jastrow (pp. 52 ff.) and Fullerton (pp. 116, 131) attribute the scenes in heaven to the author(s) of the Dialogue, but the fact that both Dialogue and Epilogue are directed against the position of the friends, not the charge of the Satan, suggests rather that the poet simply retained the Satan scenes from the folk-tale. The subtlety and sophistication which Fullerton sees in them (p. 116) are, to say the least, debatable. In relation to the Dialogue the effect, if not the purpose, of the Prologue is to assure the reader in advance that the friends are wrong, indeed to emphasize their error by making Job's righteousness itself the occasion of his misfortune. In heaven, it seems, affliction proves the very opposite of what it is taken by the orthodox on earth to prove.

Even if the Prologue does give the author's own answer to his problem, there is no reference to this answer in the speeches of Yahweh. Job knows nothing of the scenes in heaven. What is the poet's message to the sufferer himself? Possibly he means to suggest that there is an explanation known in heaven, though the one afflicted cannot discern it. There is some comfort in this thought, but if it is what the poet had in mind, the Theophany is indeed, as Ball says (p. 2), "a magnificent

irrelevance." We must find a better hypothesis than this if we are to relate the speeches of Yahweh satisfactorily to the Dialogue.

Another reason that has often been given for the absence of any explanation in 38–42 is that the writer's purpose was not to propose a new solution of the problem but only to refute the old one (so Fullerton, p. 133). If this was all he had in view we should certainly expect a very different divine speech from what we have. Such a speech as is presupposed by 42 7 and was probably found in the *Volksbuch,* clearly and unequivocally commending and vindicating Job, would be more in accord with this purpose. The present Theophany has a somewhat better justification if we suppose that the writer desired not only to refute the old dogma but also to show to what unfortunate results it led when experience proved incompatible with it. This is the view expressed by Gray (p. li): "The book aims not at solving the entire problem of suffering, but at vindicating God and the latent worth of human nature against certain conclusions drawn from a partial observation of life." Job's bitter arraignment of God then shows to what extremes a genuinely righteous man may be driven by insistence on the cruel doctrine, and the Theophany is therefore needed to guard against any impression that Job was right in his charges. The weakness of such an interpretation is that it ignores the fact that by its position, its length, and its literary power the reply of Yahweh stands as the climax of the book. If it is genuine at all, it must be central in the author's plan.

Our difficulty is due in part to studying the Dialogue by itself and assuming that nothing not found in it can be part of the poet's purpose. We should do better to take Dialogue and Theophany together and see if a common purpose can be found in both. As Gray says (p. lxii), since a theophany is needed and there are no other grounds, such as style, for rejecting the one we have, it is safest to keep it if it can be related to the rest of the book.

May it not be that to the poet's mind the absence of any answer *was* the answer? It is better to recognize that there is no answer than to hold to one which is false. Job realizes

that his charges were foolish because he sees that they were based on insufficient evidence. No amount of suffering or mystery could give man, with his limited knowledge, the right to question God's justice. The ironic tone of the Yahweh speeches reflects the poet's own indignation at such presumption. "Thus the main, if not the only, motive of the writer," says Ball (p. 4), "would seem to be to discourage mankind from striving to penetrate the impenetrable secrets of God; to bid them recognize the limits of human understanding and abstain from all attempts to lay down rules for the Divine actions even in the name of Justice and Right." If this was what the author meant to say, it was true and it was worth saying. It is worth saying today. With all that modern science has added to our knowledge of the universe in this and that particular, wisdom must still confess. "Lo, these are but the outskirts of his ways." We are still very far from being in a position to approve or condemn the government of the world. When any man presumes to question the ways of God with man, Nature still says to him, if he will hear, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" We cannot "grasp this sorry Scheme of Things entire," "shatter it to bits—and then Re-mould it nearer to the Heart's Desire." Whether we approve or no, we must "accept the universe." If there is little comfort in this, if it is neither satisfying nor inspiring, it is still better than ignorant presumption. Submission can become devotion only if we believe that God is good as well as mighty and wise, but whether or not the Book of Job teaches this, faith may add it, and the fact that the poet's message is incomplete will not make it less true or less important so far as it goes.

Many believe that the book does teach not only submission to God's power and wisdom but also trust in His goodness. Buttenwieser (p. 66) sees in 42 2, 5 f. an "act of worship" by which "Job confesses that . . . he now knows God more profoundly than ever . . . as the God of morality and boundless love." Jastrow (p. 14) finds that chapters 38 f. suggest as the answer to the problem of the book "simple faith in a mysterious power, whose manifestations are to be seen in . . . nature."

Many of the older commentators read in the speeches of Yahweh a message of trust in the face of life's mysteries. The instances of God's care of the animals are cited as proving His goodness. For myself I must confess that I can find hardly more than a possible suggestion of this. The God of these chapters is the God of Nature, and Nature, like human life, sometimes suggests goodness and sometimes indifference or even cruelty, as Job found. Some aspects of Nature suggest Providential care, as in Mt. 6 26–30, but this application is not explicitly made in Job. The poet neither clearly suggests nor combats the idea of Providence. Perhaps the reason is that he is not addressing a frightened soul but one which is too self-confident. The purpose of Yahweh's speeches is not to reassure but to humble. Job does not need to be convinced directly of God's goodness, but only to be shown that he was not justified in allowing his misfortune to make him doubt what he had always hitherto believed (*v. i.*, p. 128).

To this we may add another reason which has often been given for the absence of any explanation of Job's sufferings in chapters 38–42. Not only does the poet recognize that there is no explanation to be given; he also knows that without one a sufferer may still find peace. I see no reason to doubt that he wished his book to be of real help to those who suffered as Job did, were misunderstood as he was, and were tormented by his doubts. In order that he might not fail them as the three friends failed Job, it was necessary that he be true to actual experience, in which the sufferer finds no solution but does often find comfort. Here, it seems to me, we must go back from nearly all of the more recent interpretations to what seemed very plain to many of the older commentators. Job finds no answer to his question, but he does find satisfaction in a profound religious experience, and it does not seem at all unwarranted to infer that the poet himself believed and meant to teach that the answer to this most baffling and discouraging of all man's problems is to be found neither in traditional dogma nor in intellectual speculation but only in immediate experience of contact with God.

We have still to face the fact that the Dialogue leads us to

expect and the Epilogue presupposes a speech of vindication, whereas the tone of chapters 38–41 is distinctly one of rebuke. So striking is this that Jastrow (p. 87) thinks the Theophany was added to counteract the effect of the Dialogue. Of all the explanations of this apparent discrepancy which have been offered by scholars who regard the Theophany as a part of the original work, the most remarkable is the theory of Buttenwieser. In his hands the divine speech becomes a vindication of Job, the condemnation in it being directed against the three friends. Job has already reached comfort and assurance before Yahweh appears (pp. 39 f.). The climax of the book is found in chapter 28, which is retained as a part of Job's speech (p. 60). From the conception of material retribution Job has struggled to one of spiritual retribution, in which righteousness finds its reward in fellowship with God (p. 57). His confession in 42 1–6 is not an expression of penitence but "dramatic evidence of the transformation wrought in him" (p. 61). But Buttenwieser attains this result only by drastic emendation and a radical rearrangement of the text. For example, 27 2 does not sound very peaceful, so it is moved from its place so near chapter 28 to a much earlier position (pp. 133, 145). This is altogether too heroic, not to say Procrustean. How can 38 f. be regarded as addressed to the three friends, when the questions are all in the singular? Buttenwieser has an explanation, but it is hardly convincing: divine utterances, he says (p. 64), are regularly represented as addressed to individuals; thus 42 7 is addressed to Eliphaz only, and so is 38 2. But in 42 7 there is a direct reference to the other two friends, while there is no intimation anywhere in 38–42 6 that Yahweh has more than one person in view.

The rearrangements of the text which Buttenwieser's scheme demands are defended with great ingenuity. The arguments are surprisingly plausible, and the form claimed as original can rarely if ever be considered impossible. All the rearrangements, however, rest ultimately on the assumption that there is one speech of condemnation directed against the friends, followed by one of vindication addressed to Job (which, incidentally, is amazingly brief and entirely different from anything in the

Hebrew text). Positive evidence for this is found in the Greek of 38 2 and 40 8. All Buttenwieser's other arguments constantly come back to this. That the LXX reads as it does in these two verses is certainly striking and hard to explain. The Greek is so different from the Hebrew that, so far as I can see, neither can be derived from the other. We must simply choose between them. But this means that the verses have no evidential value, and Buttenwieser's whole case evaporates.

Another explanation of the apparent discrepancy between the Dialogue and the Theophany has been offered by Fullerton. Everything after 40 5 is rejected, and the first reply of Job in 40 3–5 is regarded as the original conclusion of the book (pp. 125 ff.). This confession, which looks like an act of submission and would naturally be so taken by an orthodox reader, is thought to be intentionally ambiguous and designed to convince the more thoughtful that the problem of suffering is really insoluble (p. 129 f.); likewise the speech of Yahweh in 38 f. artfully disguises its real purport: it sounds like a condemnation of Job, but its irony is really directed against orthodox readers who think that they can explain suffering (p. 130). The real purport of 38 f. "was that the problem of suffering, unsolved in the Dialogue, was to be subsumed under the general inexplicability of the universe" (p. 131)—which, by the way, is exactly what these speeches have been taken to mean by hosts of readers, both "pious" and "thoughtful." The ambiguity which Fullerton finds in these chapters—and which is undeniable in Job's first confession, though not necessarily intentional—is attributed to the author's desire to get his book a hearing in the face of the bold skepticism of the Dialogue (p. 133). We are reminded of Mark's explanation of the parables as intended to veil the truth from the uninitiated.

The starting point for Fullerton's theory is the conviction that in Job's revolt there had been nothing irreligious; he had done nothing to repent of and nothing for which he needed to be rebuked. But why assume that the divine speech must be either one of unqualified condemnation or one of unqualified approval? As a matter of fact, God does not imply that Job

had deserved his affliction. Neither does Job cease to hold fast his integrity. This is as true of 40–42 as of 38 f. All Job confesses is that he was mistaken in the inference drawn from his suffering. As Gray puts it (p. lviii), along with the issue between Job and his friends, "Job is also at issue with himself. The old *theory* leads inevitably to the conclusion that God is unjust, but the old *experience* of God still prompts him to trust God as being good as well as mighty." While the theory dominates, he can only beg God to leave him alone; when the experience reasserts itself, he longs for a renewal and confirmation of the old relationship. In other words, Job is satisfied, because in the God of the Theophany he recognizes the God he had known and trusted in the past. The realization that his charges of injustice were not justified allows the return of his former faith (*v. s.* p. 125). He was right in holding fast his integrity, but wrong in condemning God in order to justify himself, wrong in darkening counsel by words without knowledge. Gray reminds us (pp. lix f.) that the condemnation in Yahweh's speech to him and his vindication in the Epilogue do not have the same reference. The lack of any such bill of indictment as Job had challenged God to produce accords with the judgment of the Prologue, which is explicitly confirmed by the Epilogue. What is condemned is Job's attitude *after* the calamity, growing out of the theory of the friends and implying a knowledge of God's ways which no man possesses. Fullerton says (p. 132) that the Dialogue "shows how an honest man should act," but should an honest man charge God with injustice? Given the false conception of God which results from the dogma of retribution, he should certainly maintain his integrity and rebel against such a God, but should he hold such a conception? If as Fullerton says (p. 119), this God was but a phantom, should not a direct manifestation of the true God correct such a misconception? We may agree with Fullerton, and be grateful to him for pointing out so clearly (p. 120), that "Job's ethical triumph in c. 9" is followed by a "deepened religious experience" and in his subsequent speeches "Job is described as gradually struggling out of the clutches of the phantom God and feeling after a truer concep-

tion of the deity." Nevertheless Job seems to feel to the end that God has wronged him and owes him a public apology. Before his friends he is vindicated, as he knew he would be, but only after he has been shown and has admitted that he was wrong in charging God with injustice. There is no real discrepancy between the Dialogue and the Theophany; each needs the other to make clear its full meaning.

One more question, albeit of minor importance, calls for discussion. Was there originally only one speech and one confession, or were there two of each, as now? Jastrow assigns as reasons for rejecting 40 15–41 not only the different character of these chapters but also the fact that they "are put forward as a second speech in the mouth of Yahweh." Surely we cannot prejudge the question in that fashion! Omitting this section we still have two confessions of Job and (in 40 6–14) a second speech of Yahweh. But Jastrow holds (p. 82) that the repetition of 38 3 in 40 7 shows the whole second speech to be "supplementary and presumably by a different author." Now repetition, if not a deliberate literary device, may indicate textual disorder, but that is not necessarily an argument against authenticity. The fragmentary repetitions in 42 3 f. must be due to some corruption of the text, but if there were originally two Yahweh speeches it is not unnatural that the second should begin with a repetition of 38 3.

Fullerton (p. 123), having disposed of Job's second confession as already noted, rejects 40 6–14 also, finding it to be only an awkward addendum when simply combined with the first speech. He prefers (p. 124 n.) to regard it as the introduction to the behemoth-leviathan section. Gray also (p. xlix) treats all of 40 6–42 1 as secondary. Ball, on the other hand, remarks (p. 439) that 40 15 might naturally follow 39, 40 1–14 then being an editorial interpolation. Gray's arguments are as follows: (1) In 40 4 b Job has already thrown up his case and there is no further need for Yahweh to speak. (2) After 40 4 f. a second speech "comes perilously near nagging" (quoting Peake), and this objection is only partly mitigated by omitting verse 7 and retaining 8–14 as a second speech. (3) Without the behemoth-leviathan section the second speech is suspiciously

short. (4) There is a new subject but not sufficient distinctness of purpose in the second speech, nor does it draw from Job a really distinct or different confession: he does not withdraw his impugnment of God's righteousness. The first two and the fourth of these points hinge largely on the question of a difference between Job's two confessions. The first is, as Fullerton shows, decidedly ambiguous, but instead of seeing a subtle device for appeasing the orthodox it is more natural to suppose that Job was not yet ready for more than this non-committal capitulation. Barton, following Marshall, reads in these verses a sullen submission without conviction of error, and this accords well with the context. Job had not expected such a Theophany as this, and is unwilling to admit that he was mistaken. He is still inclined to feel that he has only been justified in his first contention that in an unequal contest with the Almighty he would not be able to "answer him one in a thousand" (9 3). It is still necessary, therefore, to prolong the Theophany until his rebellious mood is dissolved. Consequently Yahweh is not nagging in the second speech, but simply pressing the point home. It is not at all necessary to omit verse 7 (= 38 3). It is true that the second speech is very short if we omit the behemoth-leviathan section, but that section only obscures the real difference between the two speeches. Possibly the speech was once longer than it is, though we need not assume that if there were two speeches they must have been of the same length. Perhaps it was to compensate for the brevity of the second speech that the behemoth-leviathan passages were composed. The difference between the two speeches is not simply that between divine government in nature and in human life. In 38 f. Job has been shown that there is much which he does not know about God's work; now he is directly challenged to assume omnipotence and demonstrate that he can rule the world with greater justice than God has shown. It is this further challenge which breaks the last shred of his rebellion. In 42 3 he does withdraw his impugnment of God's justice, if not in 6, where the text is quite uncertain.

For his rejection of 40 7–14 as a variant in the original speech Gray gives the following reasons: (1) The effect of 40 2

is weakened by adding more. (2) 40 4 f. is better after 40 2 than after 8–14. (3) If the poet had intended to deal with Job's impugnment of God's righteousness, he would have done so more nearly on the scale of the treatment of the divine wisdom and power in 38 f. (4) If the speech of Yahweh dealt separately and concluded with the question of the divine righteousness, it would be strange that Job's confession should refer only to God's might. Now we have seen that 40 2 did not produce the required effect; more was required to bring Job to the mood expressed in 42 1–6. It is quite true that 40 4 f. belongs immediately after 2 f., but it remains there if 6–14 is retained as a second speech. The third and fourth points in Gray's argument assume that Job's impugnment of God's righteousness is not referred to until 40 6–14, but the whole force of 38 f. has just that in view: there is no point in the exaltation of God's power and wisdom except to convince Job that he has spoken unadvisedly. Finally, Job's confession in 42 3 cannot refer merely to God's might, because he has never denied it. By itself it might mean, "I knew all along that it was hopeless to resist your arbitrary omnipotence," but in conjunction with 5 it means rather, "I realize that you move upon a level quite beyond my sight and understanding."

This defense of the present order of the text leaves something to be desired. If the difference between the two speeches and the difference between the two confessions were in more immediate and obvious accord, and if the distinction between the issue on which Job is condemned and that on which he is vindicated were more explicitly drawn, we might feel more confidence. It is not certain that there were two speeches and two confessions in the original work, but the contrary has not been proved, and since the book has come down to us in this form, the burden of proof is on the negative. After all, most of our arguments in cases like this really prove no more than that we like one alternative better than the other, and we assume that the author's taste was as good as our own. The assumption honors him, of course, but it may be unwarranted.

On the whole, while the newer commentaries exhibit an amazing wealth of erudition and a great deal of keen thinking,

they do not seem to have helped us much in the larger questions of interpretation; indeed they have rather confused the significance of the book. They have raised questions which needed to be raised, however we may answer them; but with one or two exceptions (notably the I. C. C.) they have tended to push this or that theory to an extreme. For an adequate view of the purpose and meaning of the book we are about where we were before 1920, and this is as true of the final chapters as it is of the whole book. We do not see the full meaning of the Dialogue itself if we consider it apart from or over against the Theophany, nor is there any real discrepancy between them; consequently theories of composite origin like that of Jastrow and theories of reconciliation like those of Buttenwieser and Fullerton are equally unnecessary, nor is it true to say with Ball that the divine speeches are integral but irrelevant. The answer God gives to Job is what the poet regarded as the only answer man had ever received; and he was right. Job's problem is as tragically real and as hopelessly baffling today as it ever was. Smug traditional solutions do not help; they may do much harm. Yet presumptuous denial of any justice in the universe is not warranted. Who are we, to suppose that we can judge of matters so far beyond our knowledge? If we could see God face to face we should know how foolish it is to question his goodness.

THE REAL RELIGION OF ANCIENT ISRAEL

E. G. KRAELING
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

WE are accustomed to view the religion of Israel in the light of the great prophetic utterances and to consider this prophetic religion as being confronted by a debased popular religion, full of superstitious beliefs and practises. But it may be asserted with some confidence that while there was, indeed, a religion of the prophets, no such thing as a prophetic religion existed in Israel. The prophets stand forth as great individuals who rise above the absorbing processes of the group with a new and great experience of god. Our views of the popular religion of Israel have also been incorrect; merely to gather and tabulate the gross superstitions entertained by Roman Catholics would not be a delineation of the Roman Catholic religion. It is necessary to seek the central experience of a given religion as the starting point of any accurate description of it and to put the minor things that belong in the periphery in their proper place. The studies of Mowinckel[1] have provided a powerful stimulus in that direction, and it is the purpose of this paper to call attention to a few of the new viewpoints that he has presented, and to amplify them.

[1] Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien II, *Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäh's und der Ursprung der Eschatologie*, Kristiania 1922. We do not propose to enter here into the importance of Mowinckel's work for the problem of the origin of eschatology, for we intend to deal with that in detail in a forthcoming volume on *The Messianic Hope*. Mowinckel was to a certain extent anticipated by Volz, *Das Neujahrsfest Jahweh's*, 1912. Wensinck, *The Semitic New Year and the Origin of Eschatology*, *Acta Orientalia*, I, 1923, arrived at conclusions basically akin to those of Mowinckel without knowledge of the latter's work.

In all primitive religions the central experience is connected with certain highly important rites which are performed at certain seasons of the year. Most frequently an annual occasion is chosen for these solemn festivities. The purpose of all primitive worship is *recreation*, and hence such a festival may be called a Recreation-festival or even (though less happily) a New Year's festival. Where religion has advanced to the point of a belief in personal gods the recreation of the present order of nature is connected in some way with the experiences of a God. On this stage man does not view the cosmos in the light of natural law; his is a dramatic conception that sees everywhere the conflict of darkness and light, in which the light as embodied in the sungod is finally victorious. The various cycles of day and night, the months, the seasons and years are regarded from this angle. Constant voluntary acts of the deity of light for the assertion of his supremacy are necessary. The new life of every springtime is a new creation and, in the cosmologies, that which is conceived of as taking place in nature *now* is projected back into the beginning of things.[2]

The calendaric year, strictly speaking, does not exist in the primitive stages of time-reckoning. The divisions of time are merely based upon the periodicity of nature itself, coupled with the modes and needs of life. "The new year is equivalent to the new harvest, the new supplies of food which, through the raising of the taboo, are made accessible. Where there are several fruits that ripen at different times there may be several new year festivals."[3] The Jewish Hanukka or Light festival in the winter, about the time of the solstice, also possesses a new year's character.[4] Wherever the sun is worshipped as the world

[2] Cp. the important remarks of Wensinck, *l. c.*, p. 158f.

[3] Nilsson, *Primitive Time-reckoning*, p. 270. Wensinck, l. c. p. 158.—At Erech two New Year's festivals were celebrated, one in autumn, the other in spring. Meißner, *Babylonien und Assyrien*, II, p. 99.

[4] It is clearly a solar festival. Historically it commemorates the restoration of the Jewish temple by Judas Maccabaeus in 148 B. C., cf. 2 Macc. 10 5, 1 Macc. 4 51–54. Kittel, *Die Hellen. Mysterienreligion*, p. 18f., has seen the connection between Enoch, Gen. 5 23 and Hanukka. Significant is the rite of kindling lights at this festival. Cf. also Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, II, p. 209.

creator emphasis is laid upon the change from chaotic conditions into a regulated course of things. For the sun is the supreme factor in cosmic order; it rules the seasons, the days and the years. The great solar festivals naturally take place at the solstices and at the equinoxes. The difficulty of calculating these exactly may partly account for the fact that the primitive festivals extend over a large number of days.[5]

In the seasons of western Asia two periods of fruitfulness and barrenness follow one another. The glad days of spring are succeeded by the devastating heat of summer, when the sun is no longer the benevolent creator but the "burner,"[6] the "god with the glowing mouth,"[7] the god of death. Thereupon comes the season of the harvest and the autumnal rains which make the fertility of another year possible, and hence this period, during which the sun is a gracious power, is one of joy. But as the sun declines, with the arrival of the wintry season, cold rain and storm, fog and biting winds, together with the absence of light, give rise to the idea that the earth is now under the sway of the forces of death and destruction. Hence the winter solstice, which ushers in the anticipation of a new season of joy, is a period of supreme jubilation. On the other hand we can also understand that the crises of the sun are viewed as particularly ominous. "The end of the cosmos is seen in an eclipse of the sun, when the very existence of the god of order is threatened and the world is abandoned to the powers of darkness."[8] We can understand, therefore, why chaos can be regarded either as manifested in heat and drought, or in flood, storm and darkness, while cosmos, or new creation, is conceived of in terms of light, vegetation and gentle rains. Both phases are represented in the Hebrew creation stories; the typically Palestinian Yahwist describes primal chaos as a period of utter barrenness, when no rain had yet fallen upon earth and not

[5] Wensinck, *l. c.* p. 159.

[6] *Sharrapu*, a name of Gibil, a phase of the sun-god, in the "westland" *V Rawlinson*, 46.

[7] So Gibil is called in the list of gods, *IV Rawlinson*, 24, 54a.

[8] Wensinck, *l. c.* p. 188.

even a shrub of the field could grow,[9] and the Priestly author depicts it in Babylonian manner as an era when the waters and darkness prevailed over the earth.[10]

Contrary to common belief, cult is no mere formalism such as that which characterized the Jewish worship at the time of Christ. The fall of the second temple showed that Judaism could survive the cessation of cult very easily for the simple reason that its religious experience was no longer bound up with it. A cult is a form of worship in which a group participates with intense seriousness in order to obtain the "blessing" upon which its very life depends. If the cult were neglected the "blessing" would cease. From time to time, particularly at the great festivals, the most sacred and important rites are celebrated and the necessary renewal of "blessing" obtained thereby.

The "cult" is not the affair of the individual but of society, and the "blessing" which it effects is the property of the group. The individual shares it only as a member of his group, for according to primitive belief an ego exists only in identity with a great-ego, i. e., the group. A man alone has no blessing at all, he must be a member of a brotherhood and stand within a covenant that upholds him. The group and not merely the individual suffers if a member of it commits a sin; all Israel was punished by Yahweh for the transgression of Achan or Jonathan. It is apparent, therefore, that to the Hebrew psychology, the *berīth* or covenant is the fundamental thing upon which the cult rests; it is the basic relation between the divinity and the group and the chief concern of the cult is its "renewal" from time to time. To be *ṣaddīq*, "righteous," means to maintain the covenant so that the pre-requisites for further "blessing" are fulfilled. Unfortunately, however, the "righteousness" of the group is always impaired through sins committed by its members so that the group must again be "made righteous," or "justified" (*hiṣdīq*), in order to be able to receive blessing. Only the deity, the lord of the covenant, can restore it again

[9] Gen. 2 4 f.
[10] Gen. 1 2 f.

to its original state of unimpairedness. This is of tremendous importance as without such a restoration there can be no "blessing." From this angle the atonement-rites, characteristic of certain cult festivals, gain their proper interpretation. The removal of sin and uncleanness from the group is vital for the restoration of good fortune; for only thus is *shālōm,* "peace" or, more accurately, "wholeness" obtainable.[11]

The group may be damaged, however, not merely from within but also from without. Enemies may have infringed upon its "wholeness." Such a state of affairs is also injurious to the covenant, and so God must and will "justify" his people by repairing this damage and seeing to it that his people obtains "justice." Therefore Yahweh "judges" Israel's foes, because in injuring it they have committed a wrong against the covenant. It is the "right" of Israel to be the lord and ruler of other peoples, if it lives up to the faithful worship of Yahweh. For this reason it is to be expected that the cult which is concerned with the renewal of blessing will particularly consider the covenant-god's triumph over his people's enemies, who at the same time are also the enemies of the god.

In a cult the re-creation of the conditions of nature that are necessary for the existence of the group is of paramount importance. Thus the cult of an American Indian tribe that relied for its sustenance on the killing of buffalo had the purpose of insuring the coming of plenty of buffalo in the new season. The cult of a farming population is directed to the end of the fertility of the soil. Since Israel became largely an agricultural people the chief blessing that it hoped to obtain from Yahweh was the first rain and the latter rain[12] which insured good crops. To this end therefore, its annual rites were directed.

Cult is always festival, and festival always in the nature of drama. The dramatic means may be very primitive and meagre, consisting only of mimicking gestures, and manipulations with certain objects accompanied by explanatory words. It would be

[11] Cf. the fundamental discussions of Pedersen, *Israel, its Life and Culture,* 1926, p. 263 f.

[12] Deut. 11 13–17.

a mistake, however, to regard these actions as merely symbolic. They are efficacious to the very highest degree. A reality is played and thereby conjured into being. The participants in the drama experience a supreme ecstasy and are filled with new strength and power by the divine. To the primitive mind, to which all ancient Oriental mentality must be reckoned, everything is real and all things are possible. The omission of the cult festival and its drama in times of political disturbance is a great calamity, for the extant supply of blessing is constantly dwindling and must be renewed at certain intervals. The impossibility of holding the festival, or the inability of the god to go forth from his temple to attend it, is of national significance and is constantly recorded in the "Babylonian Chronicle," the brief record of the important events of neo-Babylonian history.[13]

While all the primitive phases of the ancient nature festivals survive even in the more advanced stages of civilization, new impulses enter in when the primitive people has become a nation with an established seat of power. Then the cult religion becomes a *national* cult-religion. The center of political power at once attains a vast importance. The sanctuary of the god is the source and seat of this power and therefore theoretically the whole world-order is dictated from here. The founding of the sanctuary coincides theoretically with creation; when it was established cosmos was created out of chaos.[14] Hence the Babylonian creation epic closes with the account of the origin of the Esagila temple. On the doors of the Babylonian sanctuaries the creation story was commemorated in pictorial scenes as is proven by the Cassite king Agum-kakrime's description of them,[15] and in the liturgy for the restoration of temples[16] the creation was revived. The festival of the New Year is thus at the same time that of the founding of the sanctuary and of creation, and any restoration of a temple will naturally be celebrated at the annual festival.

[13] *Keilinschr. Bibl.*, II, p. 272f.

[14] Wensinck, p. 175.

[15] Langdon, *The Babylonian Epic of Creation*, 1923, p. 10. *Keilinschriftl. Bibl.*, III, p. 134f.

[16] Weißbach, *Babylonische Miszellen*, 1903, p. 33.

Before we attempt to study the cult-festival of ancient Israel, it will be useful to consider the festivals of other cult-religions of the Oriental world to gain the proper perspective. For the anti-cultic attitude of the great prophets has largely relegated the official cult-religion of the Hebrew state, out of which Israel's hope arose, into the background, and hence the foreign analogies will help us to recognize more clearly the traces of the latter that still remain. We shall first, following Erman, deal with the Egyptian cult festivals.[17] At Edfu, the god Horus issues forth from his temple on the day prior to the actual opening of the rites, accompanied by his divine colleague Chons and the four spears with which the gods in primal times fought Seth, the representative of primeval chaos, to meet the Horus of el Kab and the Hathor of Dendera, who have come to visit him.[18] The ceremonies of the festival are concerned with a repetition of the victory over Seth. The visitors from the foreign cities who have come with their gods "sit down and drink and celebrate a festival before this honorable God; they drink and anoint themselves and rejoice loudly together with the inhabitants of the city." The first day of the festival is marked by a procession in which the gods are conducted to an "upper temple" somewhere on the edge of the desert. Here sacrifices and ceremonies follow. The "scribe of the book of God," in the presence of the divinities, proclaims the victory of Horus. Four times he calls out, "Horus has come in triumph, and everything which has been entrusted to him has been carried out. His mother Isis rejoices because he has taken up this his office with a glad heart." The gods of Edfu, "the living souls, sit upon their thrones" and look upon the "lord of the gods," and "joy goes through Edfu." The priests frequently repeat the refrain, "Rejoice, ye living souls! Horus triumphs! Everything which has been entrusted to him he has carried out!" Thereupon the

[17] The great Egyptian cult festivals do not coincide with the calendaric inauguration of the New Year. The reason for this is to be found in the fact that the Egyptian solar year of 365 days was not reconciled with the nature-year. But the creation character of these cult-festivals is plain. Cf. Mowinckel, *op. cit.* p. 30.

[18] Erman, *Die Ägyptische Religion*[2], 1912, p. 234 f.

procession starts again and goes to another place, "the hall of the school." Here a sacrifice of unclean animals is brought, and then the "scribe of the book of God" reads aloud the "worship of Horus whose inheritance is established" and four other books. During further sacrificial ceremonies in which all the names of the god are rehearsed, the priests say, "Praised art thou Re, praised art thou Chephre,[19] in all these thy beautiful names. Thou dost come hither strong and mighty and art risen beautifully and hast conquered the dragon. Incline thy beautiful face to the king." Thereupon four geese are released to fly to the four quarters to announce to the gods, "King Horus of Edfu, the great god, the lord of heaven, has taken the white crown and added to it the red one" (the white and the red crowns representing the dual monarchy of upper and lower Egypt). A man who plays the role of the "beloved son" thereupon shoots with a bow toward the four quarters and thereby is considered to have slain the foes of the god. Other ceremonies, intended to bring about the annihilation of hostile forces, follow. Thus a wax hippopotamus, upon which "the names of the enemies of all districts" of Egypt are inscribed, and crocodiles of clay are trampled under foot. The entire festivities last thirteen days, and then the visiting gods depart again to their cities.

Another characteristic cult-festival is that of the raising of the Ded-Pillar at Memphis.[20] After the king has brought a sacrifice to Osiris "the ruler of eternity," whose head is depicted in the form of the Ded-Pillar,[21] he goes with his retinue to the place where the "august pillar" lies on the ground. The ruler, with his relatives and an accompanying priest, joins in

[19] Horus has here absorbed two titles of Re, who is Chephre in the morning, Re at noon, and Atum in the evening.

[20] Erman-Ranke, *Ägypten und ägyptisches Leben*, 1923, p. 318f.

[21] This pillar is originally a tree of the conifer variety. Cf. Gressmann, *Tod und Auferstehung des Osiris*, 1923, p. 34f. Under these circumstances I feel justified in suggesting that the *el-olam* or "god of eternity" in whose honor Abram planted tamarisks at Beersheba, Gen. 21 33, was Osiris, the "ruler of eternity." There is no need for calling in the Iranian Aion speculations, as is done by Kittel, *op. cit.* p. 76, to explain the name.

the actual raising of the pillar by means of ropes, while the queen, "who fills the palace with love," looks on, and her daughters rattle the sistrum. Six minstrels intonate a hymn in praise of the god, and four priests bring sacrificial tables and set them up at the foot of the pillar. Thereupon Osiris is regarded as having come to life again. A peculiar drama now follows that, with very meagre means, describes the great primeval struggle in which Osiris triumphed over his foes. First, four priests, with fists uplifted, advance toward four opposing priests who seemingly retreat; two others, meanwhile, are engaged in real combat, and one of them invokes the aid of Horus, the god reigning through the person of the king. Then follows a regular melée in which fifteen men, in several groups, smite each other with their fists or with sticks; two of these groups, according to the inscription accompanying the scene, represent the cities Pe and Dep, so that we here plainly have an echo of some ancient combat in which these cities were involved. The rites end with driving four herds of oxen and asses four times around the walls of the city.

The death and resurrection of Osiris to which these ceremonies refer were still more vividly celebrated at Abydos.[22] "After the enemies of Osiris had been overthrown" a solemn procession to his grave in Peker, the cemetery of Abydos, ensued, where the god was duly buried. Later "that day of great battle" was portrayed "in which all his enemies were cast down upon the waters of Nedit." Then the resurrected god took his place in the great Neshmet barque in which he sailed back to his palace at Abydos amid the jubilation of the multitude, Each of these descriptions of Egyptian festivals furnishes knowledge of some interesting rite that has its parallel in New Year's festivals of the Semites of Asia.

In Babylonia the great cult-festival everywhere was the *Zagmuk*, or *resh-shatti*,[23] celebrated in spring. We can here disregard all the local festivals of the various cities which of course

[22] Erman-Ranke *op. cit.*, p. 318.

[23] Lit., "head" or beginning "of the year." On the cult-festival of Sin, the moon-god of Harran, cf. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 2, p. 305 f.

were national festivals in the days of a city's hegemony, and concentrate upon the best known of all, the New Year's festival of the city of Babylon. When Marduk created heaven and earth, and when the building of Esagila was completed, he invited his divine colleagues into his temple to rejoice and make music.[24] Quite naturally, therefore, the other deities celebrate the festival with him as often as it occurs. Hence "the gods of all the cities come to Babylon at New Year's to seize the hands of the great lord Marduk." Already Hammurapi gives his prefect at Larsa the order to transfer the goddesses of Emutbal with their sacred prostitutes to Babylon, no doubt for the festival, and in late Babylonian times a man writes to his friends at the metropolis that "the goddess Belit of Eanna (the temple of Erech) is enroute on the Euphrates to Babel." As in Egypt, the festival was an occasion of supreme rejoicing, and a general pilgrimage to the great metropolis was made.

The Zag-muk was distinctly a solar festival, for its great moment was the 11 Nisan, on which the rays of the vernal sun first struck the golden throne of Marduk in the chapel on the summit of Etemenanki,[25] the great Zikkurat or tower of Babel in the center of the Esagila area. But underneath the solar aspect lies the seasonal. Mythologically speaking, the god of light and life has triumphed over the dragon of storm and night, and his enthronization as god of Babylon and the world is repeated anew. The Babylonian creation epic gives us the account of the first enthronization of Marduk as follows: The monster Tiamat, the personification of the great primeval ocean, rebels against the gods. The greatest among the latter, Anu and Ea, attempt to battle with her but are unable to prevail. Thereupon the gods go to Marduk, the youngest among them, and beseech him to fight for them. He assents on condition that they make him king and entrust to him the "tables of fate," i. e., the right to determine the destinies of the world. Marduk is then advanced to the rank of the great gods by

[24] Creation epic VI. 53.

[25] Cf. Dombart's article, *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, 1924, p. 103f.

receiving a princely chamber; here, "before his fathers, for the kingship[26] he takes his place," and the supreme dignity is conferred on him in the words of the great gods: "We have given thee the kingship of universal power over the totality of all things." Thereupon Marduk must display his strength to the satisfaction of the assembled gods by a miracle. A garment is placed in their midst, and the new king is enjoined,[27]

> "Speak thou thy word and let the garment be destroyed,
> Command again and let the garment be whole!"

Marduk shows himself able to cope with the situation.

> "He commanded and at his word the garment was destroyed,
> Again he commanded and the garment was remade.
> As the gods his fathers saw the issue of his mouth
> They were glad and did homage (saying): 'The king is Marduk!'
> They added unto him a sceptre, a throne and a hatchet.
> They gave him the unopposable weapon overwhelming the hateful."

It is apparent that this enthronization scene is proleptic. Marduk ideally takes over the kingship and ideally creates the world. For the garment which he causes to disappear and then calls into existence again is probably a symbol of the great cosmos-mantle, a mythical interpretation of the starry heavens.[28] After the battle with the Tiamat he actually creates the cosmos, in accordance with the ability that he previously demonstrated, and takes his place in the chamber of fates as king of the gods. The kingship of Marduk is thus based on his victory and the creation of the present order of the universe culminating in the founding of the sanctuary. But the celestial enthronization scene precedes the terrestrial actuality in accordance with the idea developed by Babylonian astrology that a heavenly occurrence precedes each event on earth.

The great New Year's festival of Babel was also described as the "festival of the resurrection of the lord of the gods Marduk."[29] A new text dealing with the passion and ressurrection

[26] Langdon, *Epic etc.* p. 128 translates, "consultation," whereby the meaning of this ceremony is completely obscured.

[27] IV. 23f., Langdon *l. c.*, p. 128.

[28] Cf. Eisler, *Weltenmantel und Himmelszelt*, 2 vols., 1910.

[29] Cf. *Vorderasiatische Bibliothek*, IV, p. 114, etc.

of Marduk, when coupled with the statements of the Greek historians concerning the "grave of Bel," enables us to get a much clearer idea of the meaning and magnitude of the cult-drama which was annually enacted at Babylon.[30] The great stage-tower of *E-temen-an-ki* "the house of the foundation of heaven and earth," a replica of the mythical world mountain, was considered to be the tomb of the god during the winter months. No doubt his death and burial were celebrated in autumn, while at the spring festival he was brought to life again. These rites are clearly parallel to the Tammuz-Adonis and Osiris cults which were so universally in favor in the ancient east. The basic thing in the festival, however, was the enthronization of Marduk in accordance with the creation myth, while the passion of Marduk is of subsidiary nature,—at least on the level of the national cult-religion.

The festivities started on the 1. Nisan.[31] Manifold preparations were necessary; but we need not dwell upon them here, for only those rites interest us which have a bearing on the great ideas of the festival. On the fourth day the *urigallu*, the "Great brother" or high-priest, recited the Epic of Creation, beginning with the solemn words, "*Enuma elish la nabu shamamu*," "when above the heavens were not yet named." The reading of this sacred document naturally consumed a good part of the day. The following morning an atonement ceremony of particular interest took place in connection with the purification of the chapel of Nebo preparatory to his arrival from his temple at the nearby city of Borsippa. The head of a ram was cut off and the shrine besmeared with the bloody rump of the animal, whereupon the officiating persons threw the head and rump into the river and retired to the solitude of the plains until the festival was over. A basic affinity of this ceremony with the scape-goat rite of the Hebrew atonement day is unmistakable. Three and one-third hours after sunrise the high-priest, who was not permitted to witness the atonement rites, came forth

[30] Cf. Langdon, p. 35 f. Zimmern, *Zum Bab. Neujahrsfest*, II, 1918 Strabo, Book XVII. 5. Aelian XIII. 3. Diodorus XVII. 112.

[31] Cf. on the ritual Langdon, 20 f. Meissner, II, 95 f., and especially Zimmern, *Das Babylonische Neujahrsfest*, 1926, (*Der Alte Orient*, 25, 3).

from the sanctuary of Marduk and called for craftsmen. Various preparations were then made for Marduk's exit from his sanctuary *E-umush-a*, under the personal ministration of the high-priest. He recited a prayer telling Bel that he was about to go to the "house of the festival" outside of the city. Presently Nabu arrived in his ship from Borsippa, and then the king was conducted to the shrine of Marduk to be officially reinstated for another year. After sunset a white bull was brought into the temple court and the king set fire to a bundle of reeds which the high-priest had put into a trench especially dug for the purpose, whereupon king and priest together recited a hymn entitled "Divine bull of Anu." This ancient rite had its background in the astronomic phenomena prior to 1900 B. C. when the new year began[32] with the heliacal rise of Taurus, the constellation symbolized by the white bull, before which, therefore, the new year's bonfire was kindled. On the next day another atonement ceremony was performed in which two especially prepared wooden images, adorned with gold, precious stones, and garments, were decapitated. The "hierogamy," or divine nuptials, between Marduk and Ṣarpanit also seem to have been celebrated on this day. The climax of the festival, however, was the ceremony "when on the 8th and 11th day the king of the gods of heaven and earth took his seat in the *Duku*, the place of the determination of the fates, and the gods of heaven and earth reverently pay homage to him and stand bowed down before him and he there determines the fates of distant days."[33] Marduk presided over the divine assembly, while Nebo, "the scribe of the entirety," recorded the fates of heaven and earth. For the populace the spectacular processions of the 10. and 11. of Nisan must have been the supreme occasions of the festival. At the invitation of the king, who came "to seize the hands of Bel," Marduk issued forth in his ship-cart *Makua* to go to the "house of the festival" (*bit akitu*) outside of the city limits. His return on the 11. Nisan was of triumphal

[32] Langdon, p. 26.

[33] Cp. Meissner, II, p. 97.—*Duku* (= bright mountain) is the inner chamber of *Ubshukkina*, the place of the assembly of the gods.

character. Through the Ishtar gate and over the gorgeous pavements of the great avenue *Ai-ibur-shabum*, then past the Emaḫ temple and the residential section with the temple of Ishtar of Agade on the left and the great walls of the royal palace and the gardens of the temple to the right, the procession came to the eastern gateway of Esagila,[34] where the arriving god was welcomed by an old Sumerian hymn of the "lifting up of the hand." Once more he entered the chamber of the fates, as on the day when the temple was founded. At the cessation of the festival the tributary gods who had come to pay homage to Marduk, as well as all the pilgrims who had attended, returned home again.

The New Year's festival was characterized by unbridled license. This was rooted in its fertility character, as particularly evidenced in the hierogamy. The latter is, of course, of cultic importance; through the nuptials of Marduk and Ṣarpanit new creation and birth are brought about.[35] The licentious practices in connection with the festival have their origin in this same atmosphere of ancient magic. They are "sacred prostitution" for the purpose of conjuring forth the new fertility in nature. Another characteristic phase of the festival was the temporary cessation of all differences in rank. The slaves were permitted to dominate their masters,[36] and in place of the king a bogus king was set upon the throne, being permitted to go to any excess and even to cohabit with the royal concubines.[37] Once this had interesting consequences; when king Irra-imitti of Isin died during the New Year's festival "the gardener, Ellilbani, who (as bogus king) sat upon the throne, did not arise, but made himself king."[38] Ordinarily the bogus king was scourged and put to death after his brief sway. This is also rooted in ancient fertility rites, for the king impersonates the god and hence it

[34] Cf. Koldewey, *Das Wiedererstehende Babylon*, 4. ed., 1926.

[35] Cf. Frazer, *Origin and History of the Kingship*, 1905, p. 194f.

[36] This is supported by the description of the festival of the goddess Bau at the ancient Sumerian city of Lagash. Meissner, II, p. 94.

[37] Cf. Müller, *Fragm. Hist. Graec.* II, 495.

[38] Meissner, II, p. 99.

is the passion of the god which was here repeated.[39] The passion of the god in turn, has a particular connection with the sowing of grain, a fact that still appears in the words, "Except a kernel of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit."[40]

If we strive to penetrate through the great mass of detail to the realization of the constitutive principles of these Oriental festivals, we find that our earlier observations on the nature of cult-religion give us the clue. The *renewal* of creation is, as we saw, the basic idea of the cult, and this object is attained by the repetition of the primeval cosmic drama. With this must be associated also the renewal of the covenant between the group and the deity, involving a restoration of the group's purity by certain atonement ceremonies, and protection against its foes by rites intended to invoke the god's aid against them. Above this primitive substratum there rises, however, the thought of the enthronization of the god as king of heaven and earth and of the particular state, and the celebration of the founding of the sanctuary that is the god's seat ever since he inaugurated his first festival in it. Through these characteristics the cult-festival attains its national and political aspects. Pilgrimages, processions, a general carnival and great rejoicing are constantly recurring popular phases marking the festivities.

The religion of Israel necessarily shared to a very large extent the general heritage of eastern cult-religion. A glance at its ritual will reveal to the practised eye that the same primitive concepts underlie its theory of sacrifice, of holiness, of clean and unclean as are at the bottom of the religions of its gentile neighbors. Hence we must conclude that in Israel also annual rites were of supreme importance. Once upon a time it was the clan that celebrated an annual reunion for sacred ceremonies (1 Sam. 20 6). But the central sanctuary became the true scene of the festival of the people of a given region, and an annual pilgrimage was made to this sacred place (cf. 1 Sam. 1). If the later Hebrew calendar possesses a number of festivals, this

[39] Cf. Frazer, *l. c.*, p. 266 f.

[40] Cf. Saturn as grain-god and the Saturnalia in which this same thing is featured, Frazer, *l. c.*, p. 268.

reveals a more advanced stage and cannot destroy the fact that there is only one great, predominating festival. The latter was necessarily the heir of the old nature-festival of more primitive stages. It is clear, too, that the Hebrew re-creation festival coincided with that of the ancient Canaanites. Since the Palestinian soil, like the Arabian[41] requires rain above all things, its New Year was the *āsīf*, or festival of the "ingathering," celebrated in autumn, prior to the coming of the rains.[42] It was thus at once an occasion of thanksgiving for the benefits of the past season and of invocation to the divinity to "bless" in the coming season. The chief feature of the festival was the sacred procession, as is proven by the Hebrew word for festival, "*hag*," which is akin to the Arabian *hadj*.[43] Pilgrimages were naturally made at this time to the more important sanctuaries, sacrifices were brought and vows that had been made were fulfilled.[44] Another name of the festival, "*hillūlīm*,"[45] characterizes it as an occasion of jubilation. The completion of the harvest and the vintaging is naturally an event productive of great gladness.[46] On the other hand the festival also stimulated the inauguration of political acts such as the enthronization *of a king* by the group. For this reason the Philistines who had forbidden Israel to hold such assemblages immediately invaded the land when the

[41] The Arabian festival at Mecca bore strong similarity to the Feast of the Tabernacles. Expectations for healing autumn rains were centered upon Kuzah the god of rain and thunder who revealed himself in fire on the top of the sacred mountain at Muzdalifa. A solar rite in which the pilgrims at sunset of the 9. Dhul-Hidjdja rush toward Muzdalifa, and which is repeated on the following morning when the first rays of the sun illuminate Mount Thabir, is quoted by Wensinck, *l. c.*, p. 162. Cp. also Wellhausen, *Reste Arab. Heidentums*[2], 1897, p. 79f.

[42] The calendar inscription of Gezer begins the year with *āsīf* the month of the ingathering, cf. Lidzbarski, *Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik*, III, p. 36f.

[43] Cf. Wellhausen, *l. c.*, p. 110. Hadj, "festival," is derived from the sacred procession or "hadj" around the Kaaba at Mecca. Hadj then gets the broader meaning, "pilgrimage."

[44] Judges 21 19f., 1 Sam. 1, and 1 Sam. 1 21. Cp. Deut. 14 22f., 26 1f.

[45] Lev. 19 24, Judges 9 27, cp. Wellhausen, *l. c.*, p. 110, on the same feature in the Arabian Hadj.

[46] Ps. 126 6.

Hebrews, in defiance of the decree, held their festival of Yahweh at Mizpah.[47] At Shechem, Gaal and his Israelite clansmen plotted mutiny against the king, Abimelech, and Zebul his prefect, at the occasion of the *hillūlīm*.[48]

Concerning the cult-myths of the ancient Canaanite and earliest Hebrew local festivals, we can still draw some inferences from our records. Rites akin to those of Marduk and Osiris were evidently practiced. Thus there was a "tree of weeping" near Bethel under which Deborah, apparently an old bee-goddess, was supposed to lie buried.[49] The cultic weeping under the sacred tree must have been preparatory to the celebration of her resurrection. The wailing for Jephthah's daughter on the mountain of Gilead,[50] and for Hadad-Rimmon in the plain of Megiddo,[51] were rites of the same nature. An echo of the lamentation at the burial of the gods of vegetation is to be found in the practice of ritualistic weeping when the grain is planted, as it is presupposed in the words, "He goeth forth and weepeth who sows the precious seed, he cometh home again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him."[52] Eisler suggests that in the figure of Joseph, "the multiplier," we have an old nature-divinity, the grain-god of Shechem, whose passion story may be reflected in Gen. 37[53] and who was probably worshipped there by being "buried" in the pit in effigy. Beneath the guise of the later tradition we may thus discover the *dromenon* of primitive nature cults of early times.

At Jerusalem the annual festival was known as *Succoth*, or "tabernacles."[54] It is expressly stated to have been celebrated

[47] 1 Sam. 7 6.

[48] Judges 9 27 f.

[49] Gen. 35 8, and Eisler, *Weltenmantel etc.*, p. 158.

[50] Jud. 11 40.

[51] Zech. 12 11. Cp. on this god, Dölger, *Ichthys*, II, *passim*.

[52] Ps. 126 6. Gressmann, *Tod und Auferstehung des Osiris*, 1923, p. 20 f. Weeping was a good omen for a rich harvest. Cp. the weeping of the Babylonian king at the New Year's festival, which was a good omen for the ensuing year. Cf. also Schrank, *Babylonische Sühnriten*, p. 91 f.

[53] Eisler, *op. cit.*, p. 276 f.

[54] Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*, 1907, p. 395, would connect the name with the god Sikkut, to whom Am. 5 26 refers as Israel's "king."

after the end of the year in the month of Ethanim (= Tishri) with which the New Year began.[55] The custom of camping in huts of boughs and leaves during the festival is plainly of primitive character. The underlying idea was the renewal of vegetation. Forest and orchard were to be conjured to spread their canopy of leaves to the joy of men. With this may early have been associated the idea of the hierogamy or sacred nuptials of the gods.[56] In the Adonis cult of the Canaanites the bed upon which the hierogamy of Adonis and Aphrodite took place was sheltered with a canopy of fresh green. Since the latter festival also took place after the autumn harvest, and since the Adonis-gardens and the tabernacles were both set up either on the roofs or in the outer courts and both had associated with them the water libation, the likelihood of a direct connection between the two is very great.[57] It is not accidental that the Song of Songs was a part of the scroll for the Feast of the Tabernacles in late Jewish times. Solomon and Shulamith, it seems, were substitutes for the divinities whose mention could not be tolerated by Judaism, but whose hierogamy lived on in this innocent guise.[58] The great tenacity of nature-worship becomes apparent when we consider some of the rites that hold a position of importance in connection with this feast at the time of Christ. Thus the celebration was inaugurated by a nocturnal torch-dance which clearly shows the purpose of the festival to be the renewal of the light of the sun.[59] Similarly the water-libation has its basis in the purpose of bringing about rain;[60] the "fountains of salvation" from which the water is obtained are waters conveying a

[55] Ex. 23 16, 34 22.

[56] Eisler, pp. 565, 596. The practice of sacred prostitution "on every high hill and under every green tree" is an echo of this hierogamy.

[57] Gressmann, *Tod und Auferstehung des Osiris*, p. 17.

[58] Cp. Meek's claim that Canticles is a Tammuz liturgy. *AJSL*, 39, 1 f. *JBL*, 43, 245 f., and Waterman, *JBL*, 44, 171 f.

[59] Cp. the Hanukka festival which has borrowed this feature of the renewal of "light." The antiquity of the use of torches at the New Year's festival may be inferred, perhaps, from Judges 7 16 f., which has earmarks of being composed with reference to some New Year's dramatization of an ancient victory.

[60] Cp. Volz, *Das Neujahrsfest Jahweh's*, p. 31.

particular salutary effect, or blessing, by virtue of their sanctity.[61] The procession with the branches and fruits about the altar is another practice calculated to reawaken nature. Peculiarly interesting is the rite of establishing contact between each individual and the altar so that the power inherent in the altar can go forth upon the worshippers. "Form a cordon with branches, unto the horns of the altar."[62] If the Mishna tells us that the branches were finally set up around the altar with the benediction, "Beauty to thee, O Altar," the underlying idea is the recharging of the altar with new power in order that it may be able, thus replenished, to give forth more blessing.[63] Thus the primordial characteristics of the festival lived on.

In pre-exilic times the Succoth feast was far more comprehensive in character than later, for it doubtless included three great festivals that in after days were independent, Rosh-ha-shanah or "New Year" on the 1. Tishri, the Atonement day on the 10. Tishri, and the Feast of the Tabernacles on 15–21. Tishri.[64] They were not yet separate entities in the days of the Deuteronomic law.[65] The change of calendar, probably inaugurated under the Chaldean domination just before the exile, however, made the year begin in spring with the month of Nisan and thus converted the Paschal and Mazzoth feasts into the real New Year's festival. The Exodus-story, originally intimately connected with the autumnal celebration was transferred to the spring festival to become the cult myth of the Passover.[66] In the wake of this change followed the above mentioned division

[61] Is. 12 3 f. is recited when the priest, entering the temple via the water-gate, brings the golden vessel with water from the pool of Siloam to the high-priest, who stands at the altar in his full regalia to offer the libation.

[62] Ps. 118 27. Haupt, *ZAW*, 1915, 102 f. Mowinckel, p. 105.

[63] Mowinckel, *l. c.*, correctly points out that "beauty" (*yophī*) is here synonymous with "holiness;" it is Otto's *fascinosum*.

[64] Mowinckel, pp. 83 f., 206 f.

[65] Deut. 16.

[66] A connection between Succoth and the Exodus is still revealed by Lev. 23 43. Ps. 81 is, in Jewish tradition, connected with the celebration of the feast of the Tabernacles, and not with the Passover, as one would expect from the reference to the Exodus.

of the Succoth Feast into three independent holidays, but in spite of this reduction it could not be dislodged from its place of great importance. As late as Josephus and Plutarch[67] it was regarded as the most sacred of Jewish festivals. When the Gola, or "captivity," of Ezra celebrated its reunion with the colony of Jerusalem, and wished to make the day one of a great renewal of the national life, it chose the feast of the tabernacles as the occasion.[68] It was a day of great rejoicing, of sacrifice and blowing of the ramshorn trumpets, a day of the giving of presents and of feasting and drinking. Significant, too, was the reading of the law by Ezra on the first day of the feast from morn to midday. Whereas in earlier days the mythical or historical explanation of the world must have played the decisive role of cult-myth, the new Jewish legalism considered the Mosaic constitution the basis of the life of the nation. Yet even here it was not possible to get away from the ancient creation character of the feast. The mere fact that Ezra, as he read the law, stood in the street before the "water gate" shows the connection of this rehearsal with the rite of the libation to which we have already referred. Since the latter is rooted in the creation-idea it is attractive to suppose that the reading of the law has usurped the place of a creation story which was previously rehearsed at this occasion, just as the epic "*Enuma-elish*" was read at the Babylonian New Year's festival. One phase of the original celebration, however, had dropped into oblivion with the downfall of the state. Just as the other national cult-festivals of oriental peoples celebrated the sovereignty of their chief god, so the cult-festival of Israel in the days of the monarchy must have been the celebration of Yahweh's sovereignty.

In the early times Yahweh is never, as in the late Rabbinic texts, compared to a king,—he *is* the king.[69] He is the one "who sits (enthroned) on mount Zion," who roars forth from Zion and from Jerusalem gives forth his voice.[70] In a very

[67] *Sympos.* IV, 5.
[68] Neh. 8.
[69] Hempel, *ZAW*, 1924, 80.
[70] Is. 6 5; Amos 1 2.

present sense he is the "judge of all the earth."[71] The relation of the reigning monarch to the king, Yahweh, is a subject too large to enter upon here. It is sufficient to take note of the fact that Yahweh's kingship is the primary thing to the Hebrew. Historically, of course, the kingship of Yahweh did not come into existence until a monarchy had been established at a definite capital, for *melek*, "king," originally "counsellor," is the title of the ruler of a Canaanite city state.[72] Before Saul's time Yahweh was merely *Elohē Yisrāēl*, "god of the Israel tribe," and therefore a "*baal berīth*," or "covenant god." He became "king" when Israel adopted the monarchy. But the oriental point of view is different; here the deity's kingship is believed to precede that of the earthly rulers. Therefore the temple is also the true seat of the government. It is not accidental that the Babylonian word *ēkallu*, "palace," became the Hebrew word for temple, *hēkal*, for the temple is nought else than the palace of the divine king. Therefore Jerusalem is the "daughter of Zion" because Zion, the temple-hill, is the source of the city's life. The basic importance of the temple is still plain from Haggai's teaching that Yahweh will only "bless," i. e. give fertility, to the land if the desolate temple be rebuilt. Since the king Yahweh has his seat in Zion the future kingdom can be described as "sovereignty of the daughter of Zion."[73] It is interesting to note that the sovereignty of Babylon, too, is vested in the sacred precinct where the god Marduk resides, who as determiner of the fates of the world bears the title "king of heaven and earth."

Since the sovereignty of Yahweh was a present reality it required renewal, and to this end the annual festival was directed. The oldest allusions to a celebration of Yahweh's kingship are found in the Balaam pericope, Num. 24 21: "Yahweh his god is with him, and the shout of a king is among them;" and in Hosea 7 5: "To-day is the festival of our king." The connection between the celebration of the sovereignty of Yahweh

[71] Gen. 18 25.
[72] Von Gall, *Wellhausen-Festschrift*, p. 152.
[73] Mic. 4 8.

and the New Year's festival is definitely established by Zech. 14 16, where the coming of the Gentiles to Jerusalem in the latter days at the occasion of the Feast of the Tabernacles to pay homage to the *king* Yahweh is referred to. Here the present cultic reality that has secondarily been projected into the future is directly traceable. Yahweh's Sovereignty, as established by subjugation of his enemies and his enthronization on Zion, was the real theme of the Feast of the Tabernacles, when the latter was the great state festival of the royal city of Jerusalem. It is an interesting fact that the *Malkiyoth*, or passages of the Old Testament dealing with the sovereignty of God, along with the *Shofaroth*, or passages mentioning the trumpet blowing, and the *zikronoth*, those referring to God's "remembrance" of his creatures, are the scripture lessons for the Succoth feast in the Mishna.

We saw in the case of the royal cult-festivals of Babylon and Egypt that the idea of the deity's sovereignty was closely connected with the creation of the world. In Israel the real cult myth of Yaweh's sovereignty was the Exodus-legend. But here, too, there was a strong trend toward going back to the beginning of things and toward connecting Yahweh's kingship with creation. No doubt the primitive myths of Yahweh's victory over Leviathan or Rahab, as outlined by Gunkel in his *Schöpfung und Chaos*, give us a clue to the kind of creation myth utilized at the great festival of Israel. I shall pass over this matter of the cult-myth here, however, inasmuch as I intend to deal with it in detail elsewhere.

In the pre-exilic festival the ark must have played a prominent part. Yahweh is the one who "sits enthroned between the cherubim."[74] The ancient Hebrew *hag* or "feast" of Jerusalem must therefore have been a procession with the ark.[75] The vast importance of this object for the cult may also be inferred from its titles "Ark of Yahweh," or "Ark of the Covenant," or "Ark of the Lord of all the Earth." It is self-

[74] 1 Sam. 4 4; 2 Sam. 6 2. Cf. Gressmann, *Die Lade Jahweh's*, 1920, p. 20.

[75] Cp. Hartmann, *ZAW*, 1917–18, 225. Gressmann, *l. c.*, p. 3 f. on the ark as sacred processional object. Yahweh becomes "the lord of all the earth" (Josh. 3 11 f.), wherever the ark is borne about.

evident, in view of the cultic character of Israel's religion, that this potent object, which radiated holiness and hence could confer both blessing and curse,[76] can not have reposed idly in its adyton. Like the idol of Marduk which issued from its shrine at Babylon once a year, the ark was doubtless brought forth annually from the Holy of Holies for the supreme occasion. Such was its holiness that to gaze upon it at other times than at the festival was fraught with grave danger.[77] Of course on the festive days all sorts of precautions were taken to direct this destructive phase of the ark's sanctity towards the god's enemies rather than toward his adherents. But just this very fact of its dangerous qualities was essential to the cult, in which the defeat of the adversaries of Yahweh and his people was among the things to be conjured up. How prominent this idea was may be seen from the old cultic formula for the exit of Yahweh's ark from its shrine:[78]

> "Arise, Yahweh, that thine enemies be scattered,
> And they that hate thee flee before thee."

With this may be compared the address to the idol of Marduk and his spouse at the New Year's festival of Babylon, less militant in tone because the supremacy of Marduk was better established:

"Go forth lord, the king waits;
Go forth, our lady, the king awaits thee.
The lord of Babylon issues forth, all lands are bowed down before him."[79]

Yahweh's sovereignty is extremely military in character. His throne is established over his prostrate foes, and hence the renewal of his victory in the cult-drama is of primary importance.

Since it was the proud boast of the Davidic dynasty that its ancestor first brought Yahweh in to Jerusalem, and since the creation-festival, naturally, as in Babylon, had its climax in the creation of the sanctuary and the first annual festival held in it by the god, a two-fold reason existed for the yearly repetition

[76] 2 Sam. 6 7, 11.
[77] 1 Sam. 6 19.
[78] Num. 10 35 f.
[79] Cf. Zimmern, *Neujahrsfest*, p. 18.

of the arrival of the ark. Every indication, therefore, favors the assumption of Mowinckel that the accounts of the induction of the ark under David and Solomon[80] give us the clue to an important phase of the cult-drama of Jerusalem. The 132. Psalm may then, with this author be interpreted as a liturgy for this occasion, and it must be admitted that this is particularly attractive in view of the fact that the account of 2 Chronicles 6 41 f. borrows vv. 8–10 of the psalm. The theme of the poem is the recovery of the ark at Baalath, or Kiriath Jearim. The dramatic performance naturally began by taking the ark out to this town, or else only to the outskirts of the city, to the house of Obed Edom.[81] The reigning king, Mowinckel thinks, impersonated David by bringing home the sacred object to Jerusalem once more. At this occasion he was clad in priestly garments and personally officiated at certain sacrifices,[82] for the king was originally the chief-priest of the god. Perhaps he was reinstated in an especial ceremony, as was the king of Babylon; Ps. 132 10,

[80] 2 Sam. 6 and 1 Chron. 15 f. 1 Kgs. 8. 2 Chron. 5–7. Cf. Mowinckel, p. 109 f. An interesting parallel to the induction of the ark is the return of Nanai to Erech, *Vorderasiat. Bibliothek*, VII, 2, p. 58. Just as Yahweh finds his "resting-place forever," Ps. 132 14, so Nanai is made to dwell in a *parak darāti*, "a shrine of everlasting." But this does not preclude an annual exit at the festival!

[81] 2 Sam. 6 5, 41. Theoretically, but probably not actually, the ark stayed three months in the house of Obed Edom, because of the fear of evil consequences from its presence in the city. "Pereṣ Uzzah," for which an etymological story has been invented, may have some connection with the Assyrian word *paraṣu*, "sanctuary," and was perhaps the adyton of this temple. Uzzah is "strength." The phrase perhaps means "the shrine of the potent object." The house of Obed Edom may then have been an originally pagan sanctuary where the destructive effect of the ark was to be regarded with equanimity. There was a Palestinian goddess Edom, spouse of Reshef, the god of pestilence (cf. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, 1896, p. 316, Hommel, *Geographie und Geschichte*, etc., 1906, p. 164). The depositing of the ark in this place may have had the purpose of neutralizing the pestiferous activities of this divinity in the interest of the population of Jerusalem. From 2 Sam. 24 16 f. we may conclude that the founding of the sanctuary of Jerusalem on the site of Arauna's threshing floor had some connection with the worship of the deity of pestilence.

[82] 2 Sam. 6 13.

and the phrase "renew the kingship" in 1 Sam. 11 14, point in that direction.

Either at the occasion of leaving or of returning to the city the sacred object must have been borne about the walls. The purpose of such a rite, to which we have related an Egyptian analogy, was to impart the strength of the god to the fortifications in order to render them impregnable. This is indeed the significance of the procession along the newly built walls of the post-exilic city which Nehemiah ordained: "The priests and Levites hallow themselves and then they hallow the people, the gates and the wall."[83] Having absorbed "holiness" from its source in the temple, they transfer it also to the city's new defences. We can rest assured that so potent an object as the ark of Yahweh was the primary factor in similar rites of pre-exilic times. This assertion receives indirect support from the story of the fall of Jericho.[84] The procession with the ark around Jericho for seven days corresponds to the length of the feast of Tabernacles, whose characteristic *shofar-* (or trumpet-) blowing is very prominent in the narrative. The magic character of the procession is plain; the holiness of the deity is to be imparted to the city, but since it is a pagan city the destructive character of this holiness is made manifest. It drives out the "strength" of the pagan god, so that the walls collapse. The opposite effect of strengthening the walls naturally resulted when the ark was carried about Yahweh's own city, and such stories as this helped to enhance the faith in this marvelous object. The conception of a procession about Jericho was simply modelled after the sacred procession about Jerusalem, to which the New Year's Psalm, 48, also refers:

> "Walk about Zion and go round about her and count her towers,
> Mark well her bulwarks and walls and consider her citadels."

The liturgy for the return of the ark to the sanctuary is, Mowinckel thinks, still preserved in the 24. Psalm. As a prayer of the "lifting of the hand" was sung when Marduk came to the gate of Esagila, so the following chant may have been

[83] Neh. 12 27 f. Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, p. 106.
[84] Josh. 6.

uttered when the ark reached the gate of the city or of the temple:

> "Lift up your heads, o ye gates,
> even be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors,
> that the glorious king may enter!"

Before the imagination of the devotees in the festive procession Yahweh, who is present with his ark, is of gigantic stature; it is not enough that the gates be swung open. They must lift up their heads, i. e., be raised up high so that he can pass through.[85] But the sentinel who watches over the god's palace must be sure that it is the real king who is seeking entrance and hence must inquire:

> "Who is this glorious king?"

Tumultuous is the cry from without the gates:

> "Yahweh, the mighty hero,
> Yahweh, the hero in battle!"

After the same invitation and question have been repeated in due solemnity the full cult-name of the divinity was pronounced:

> "Yahweh Ṣabaoth,
> he is the glorious king!"

We may imagine that this cult-drama was one that brought joy to all participants. At this occasion were sung hymns especially composed for the day beginning with the invitatorium, "Sing unto Yahweh a new song." The *terūā*, or "shout," and the blowing of the *shofar*, or ram's horn trumpet, accompanied the journey of the god to his temple:

> "God has gone up amid a shout,
> Yahweh amid the sound of the trumpet." (Ps 47 6.)

The procession was not stately or measured but rather in the nature of an ecstatic dance.[86] The dance is a natural expression of the ecstatic cultic experience of being filled with the spirit of the divinity. At the same time it is also conducive to achieving this ecstatic condition, which is so important a means for obtaining the divine "strength." Ecstatic joy was a proof

[85] H. Schmidt, *Die Thronfahrt Jahweh's*, 1927, p. 20, thinks Yahweh had a chariot, cp. Ps. 65 12.

[86] 2 Sam. 6 5. Cp. Oesterley, *The Sacred Dance*, 1924; Mowinckel, p. 112.

that the deity had come to his people.[87] For this reason David, having danced before the ark, feels that God is with him, when reproved by Michal for his plebeian conduct.

The rites of the festival came to an end when Yahweh, like Marduk, returned again to his *menuha*, or "resting place," until another year.[88] When he arrived there the words were recited—

> "Return, O Yahweh,
> thou myriads of regiments of Israel."

Enthroned again as king of his people and of the world, Yahweh's first act must have been to receive the homage of his people and tributaries, as Zech. 14 16 presupposes.

Hans Schmidt[89] has tried to go beyond Mowinckel in the matter of the processions of the great Yahweh-festival. But we shall refrain from entering into the subject any further, because too much use of the imagination is not apt to make the case more convincing. We must doubtless admit that it is next to impossible fully and accurately to reconstruct the ancient cult-festival of Israel. But the great weight of the analogies that we have cited, and the recognition of the real nature of the Hebrew religion as shown by the large primitive element in its ritual, give us the right to utilize certain O. T. passages which almost force themselves upon one's attention for an attempt at reconstruction. But all these details have only an accidental interest. Our main purpose is to point out the importance of the cultic and national phases of the religion of Israel for any adequate treatment of that subject.

[87] Neh. 8 10.

[88] Cf. the liturgy addressed to Marduk at his return to the temple, which constantly reechoes the idea that he should "calm himself," "*nuḫ belum.*" Cf. Jensen, *Texte zur Assyrisch-Bab. Religion*, 1915, p. 36 f.

[89] *Die Thronfahrt Jahweh's*, 1927.

PSALM 14 UND 53

KARL BUDDE
UNIVERSITÄT MARBURG

IN der letzten Nummer unseres Journal (1927, p. 186–192) bietet Charles C. Torrey, mein verehrter Kollege, vor Beginn dieses Jahrhunderts mein lieber Zuhörer in Straßburg i. E., einen Aufsatz "The Archetype of Psalms 14 and 53". Schön und schlagend ist, was er zu Anfang beibringt, der Vergleich dieses Doppeltextes im Psalmbuch mit den wechselnden Textgestalten desselben Liedes in den Gesangbüchern unserer christlichen Kirchen und Gemeinden. Unzweifelhaft richtig ist dann, ehe er an die Vergleichung der beiden Textgestalten herantritt, die Feststellung (p. 187), daß das Lied in dem Versmaß 3 | 2, in Versen mit einer längeren ersten Zeile von drei Hebungen, der eine kürzere von nur zwei Hebungen folgt, gedichtet sei. Er nennt das Versmaß „the 'lyric' meter". Das trifft ohne Zweifel zu für Deuterojesaja und in besonderem Sinne, als das Versmaß des Volksliedes, für die Wallfahrtslieder Ps. 120–134; unser Gedicht wird Torrey dagegen gewiß nicht als lyrisch im engeren Sinne ansprechen, und noch viel weniger etwa Ps. 19 8–14. Vielleicht lohnt es aber hervorzuheben, daß dies in alter Zeit das regelmäßige Versmaß des israelitischen Leichenklagelieds war.[1] Ich glaube, daß es sich in unsrem Psalm dem überlieferten Wortlaut gegenüber ohne große Schwierigkeit noch weit entschiedener durchführen läßt, als Torrey es für richtig hält. Nur einmal kommt er dem Tonfall durch einen leichten Eingriff zu Hilfe, indem er dem יָדְעוּ in V. 4 den Inf. abs. יָדוֹעַ vorausschickt und so die drei

[1] Vgl. Karl Budde, "The folk-song of Israel in the mouth of the prophets" (The New World, March 1893, p. 28–51).

Hebungen für die erste Zeile gewinnt.[2] Überhaupt zeichnet sich seine Behandlung des Textes durch großen Konservatismus aus; es ist dies in den Versen 1–4 und 7 die einzige Änderung, die er vorschlägt.

Neues bringt Torrey im Grunde nur zu V. 5, 6, wo die beiden Paralleltexte weit auseinandergehn, und ihnen nur gilt die Überschrift des Aufsatzes; denn hier sucht er in der Tat den Archetypus zu gewinnen, auf dem beide Texte unter Vermittlung einer vorausgesetzten frühen Verderbnis beruhen. Hier allein (p. 189) streift er auch einmal seine Vorgänger, mit dem Satze "Certainly no satisfactory explanation of the divergence has been found hitherto". Dieser Satz gibt mir den Anlaß, an Torreys Aufsatz anzuknüpfen und einen eigenen Beitrag zu der anziehenden Frage zu bieten. Denn zu seinen Vorgängern gehöre auch ich; nicht weniger als dreimal habe ich den Gegenstand behandelt.[3] Ich darf voraussetzen, daß Torrey auch von meiner Mitarbeit weiß; wäre sie ihm im ganzen Umfange bekannt, so müßte ich mich eben mit allen Anderen darein schicken, daß sie ihn nicht befriedigt hätte. Aber für sehr möglich, ja wahrscheinlich halte ich, daß er sich mit meiner letzten Äußerung dazu, dem Aufsatz „Zum Text der Psalmen" in der Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, begnügt hat, daß er darüber hinaus um 14 Jahre, auf die Expository Times, zurückzugreifen für überflüssig hielt, mein volkstümliches Büchlein „Die schönsten Psalmen" vollends ihm wohl gar nicht zu Gebote stand. Leider aber bieten diese beiden Stellen allein die Begründung meiner tief einschneidenden Vorschläge, während der Aufsatz „Zum Text der Psalmen" jenes Büchlein voraussetzt und nur dem Fachmann in größter Kürze die hebräische Unterlage dafür bieten will. Ich muß fürchten, daß diese durch den Raum gebotene Kürze dem, der das Büchlein nicht kennt und auch auf die ausführlichen Darlegungen von 1901 nicht zurückgreift, die

[2] Für die Wortfolge יָדוּעַ יָדְעוּ hätte er nicht auf Jer. 3 1 (mit חנף) zu verweisen brauchen; sie kommt gerade mit ידע mehr als ein dutzendmal und ausnahmslos vor.

[3] "Psalm Problems II" (Expository Times, March 1901, p. 285-288); „Die schönsten Psalmen", Leipzig (1915), S. 39, 101 f.; „Zum Text der Psalmen" (ZATW 1915, S. 175–195, vgl. S. 181 f.).

Gründe für meine Anschauung und die daraus folgenden Vorschläge nicht klar werden läßt, sodaß ich mich nicht wundern darf, wenn auch sie Torrey nicht befriedigt haben. Da aber anderseits sein neuer Vorschlag mich durchaus nicht überzeugt, ergreife ich hier das Wort von neuem. Als schönsten Erfolg würde ich es begrüßen, wenn es mir gelingen sollte, Torrey selbst für meine Anschauung zu gewinnen oder ihr wenigstens näher zu bringen. Aber auch eine ganze Reihe von Verbesserungen meines Vorschlags und meiner Auslegung, die ich zu bieten habe, dürften eine neue Behandlung meinerseits rechtfertigen.

Bei meinen Bedenken gegen Torreys neue Fassung des Psalms, die er uns am Schluß dankenswerter Weise auch in unmißverständlicher Übertragung darbietet, will ich einsetzen, und zwar ganz am Ende des fraglichen Absatzes, bei V. 6. "How will ye shame the counsel of the lowly?" Einen „Ratschlag, Plan, Entschluß" des עָנִי gibt es gar nicht: das ist eine *contradictio in adjecto*, weil עָנִי ein durchaus passiver Begriff ist, sein Träger als solcher nur leidet, nur der Gegenstand des Handelns Andrer ist. Das ist ja der Grund, weshalb viele Ausleger עָנִי als *gen. obj.* gefaßt haben, „Anschlag auf, gegen den Elenden, Gedrückten", was dann neutro-passivische Fassung des Verbums, „ihr werdet zu Schanden werden" nach sich zieht, auch vorsichtiger Weise die Verbesserung מֵעֲצַת für „Mit dem Anschlag". Das wäre zweifellos besser, aber auch nicht recht einleuchtend; denn gegen den עָנִי bedarf es keines langen Planes, er wird einfach vergewaltigt, ja er ist es schon, laut Zeugnis seines Namens. — Ob die freie Einfügung von בַּמֶּה ("How will ye shame") den Fall verbessert, muß ich bezweifeln. Auf eine Frage folgt kein Begründungssatz, und doch liegt für das כִּי, das 6 b einführt, die Bedeutung „denn, weil" durchaus am nächsten. Der Dichter hätte sich sehr undeutlich ausgedrückt, wenn er es als "since", „während" ("since the Lord is his refuge") wollte aufgefaßt haben; was Torrey hier sucht, wäre mit וְיהוה zu geben gewesen.[4] — Aber die Bedenken grei-

[4] Wellhausen hilft sich damit, daß er עֲצַת עָנִי mit "the faith of the godly" wiedergibt und כִּי einen Inhaltssatz einführen läßt, "that JHVH

fen meines Erachtens tiefer. Wer sind die mit „ihr“ (ye) Angeredeten, die hier zum ersten Male und nur hier auftreten? Sollen sie sich irgend in den Zusammenhang des Psalms fügen, so müssen wir sie mit den Übeltätern gleichsetzen, die V. 4 in der 3. Person einführt, und ich zweifle nicht, daß das auch Torreys Meinung ist. Die aber „verschlingen Jahwes Volk wie Brot“ (devour my people[5] like bread), mißhandeln, ja vernichten es also: wie kann dem gegenüber in V. 6 ausgesagt werden, daß sie sich vergeblich bemühen werden, den „Plan des Elenden“ zu Schanden zu machen, ja schon in 5 b, daß Jahwe ihren Plan zu nichte gemacht habe (the Lord brought their counsel to nought)? Hier rächt es sich, daß Torrey V. 4 präsentisch faßt, d. h. von der Gegenwart versteht — augenscheinlich, weil er ihn als Unterlage für seinen V. 6 nicht entbehren konnte — während das שָׁם von V. 5 ihn nötigt, diesen Vers von der Vergangenheit zu verstehn. „Damals“ (Then): ja, wann denn? Dies „damals“ hat nur dann Sinn, wenn der Dichter damit den Zeitpunkt in der Vergangenheit aufgreift, den Jahwe selbst in V. 4 ins Gedächtnis ruft. Das יָדְעוּ von V. 4 darf deshalb nicht, wie Torrey es tut, auf die Gegenwart bezogen, die Frage הֲלֹא יָדְעוּ nicht absolut, „haben denn keinen Verstand“ (Have they no knowledge), aufgefaßt werden, sondern muß auf die Vergangenheit gehn: „habens nicht erfahren?“.[6] Weil ich fühlte, daß dies deutlicher sollte ausgesprochen sein, und zugleich das Fehlen einer Hebung für die erste, längere Hälfte des Verses zu einer Ergänzung des sichtlich geschädigten Wortlauts aufforderte, habe ich 1915 hinter ידעו ein מֵעוֹלָם ein-

is his refuge”, in den Notes: “the practical conviction upon which the godly found their life, *viz.* the assurance that JHVH is their refuge.” Aber das bedeutet עֵצָה nirgends; auch fehlt dann jeder Abschluß des Gedankens.

5 Ich bin durchaus mit Torrey (p. 189) einverstanden, daß der ganze Vers 4 — und nur dieser Vers — der Ausspruch Jahwes ist, „mein Volk“ also „Jahwes Volk“ bedeutet. So verbessert sich auch Duhm in der zweiten Auflage, während Gunkel wieder die ganz unwahrscheinliche Auffassung vertritt, daß der Sänger von „seinem Volke“ rede.

6 Daß es ebensowenig gestattet ist, es לא יִרְעוּ zu sprechen und auf die Zukunft zu beziehen, wie man vielfach getan hat, brauche ich hier nur anzudeuten.

gefügt: „Habens nicht einst erfahren?“ Dem metrischen Bedürfnis genügt aber auch die oben schon angeführte Herstellung Torreys הֲלֹא יָדַע ידעו. Ich kann mich ihr anschließen[7] und auf den Zusatz מֵעוֹלָם verzichten; aber für יָדְעוּ würde ich dann יְדָעוּנִי lesen: „Lernten mich nicht gründlich kennen?“ Damit erst wird deutlich das Grundmotiv unsres Psalms aufgegriffen, die Leugnung des Daseins Gottes, das אֵין אֱלֹהִים des Toren in V. 1, während davon weder der überlieferte Wortlaut von Ps. 14 noch Torreys Wiederherstellung das Geringste verspüren läßt; damit erst genügt der kurze Einspruch Jahwes in V. 4 allen gerechten Anforderungen.[8] — Ich will, ehe ich zu dem letzten, entscheidenden Schluß übergehe, die Einzelheiten zu dem Jahwespruch V. 4 erledigen. Das כָּל־ vor פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן streiche ich ebenso wie Torrey nach Ps. 53 MT: es dehnt die Aussage auf alle Fälle aus, unrichtig, weil Jahwe auf einen einzigen Fall in der Vergangenheit zurückweist. — Auch über das längst beanstandete אכלו bin ich der Sache nach mit Torrey einverstanden, daß es nämlich das folgende לֶחֶם regiert; nur muß ich gegenüber seinem Versuch nominaler Rektion an der verbalen festhalten. Zu dem *nomen subst.* אֹכֶל einen archaistisch-poetischen *status constructus* אָכְלוֹ statt אֹכֶל (wie חַיְתוֹ, בְּנוֹ 2 mal, מַעֲיָנוֹ 1 mal) zu postulieren, ist an sich schon gewagt, hier aber m. E. unmöglich, weil אֹכֶל überall nur konkret für den Gegenstand des Essens, „Speise“, gebraucht wird, niemals abstrakt für die Handlung des Essens.[9] Man wird also doch das gute *βρώσει ἄρτου* der LXX mit ganz leichter Verbesserung in אָכוֹל לֶחֶם zurückübersetzen müssen, „als wenn sie Brot äßen“, „wie

[7] Vgl. meine Herstellung von 1915 zu Ps. 20 7: עתה יָדַע ידעתי.

[8] Es lohnt wohl darauf hinzuweisen, wie genau das Verhältnis von V. 2 f. zu V. 4 dem von Ps. 2 4 zu V. 6 entspricht: dieselbe knappe Kürze, derselbe verächtliche Spott. Natürlich ist in Ps. 2 die Reihenfolge V. 4, 6, 5 herzustellen, wie ich das 1915 festgestellt habe. Kittel[2] billigt es mit einem „vielleicht“, Bertholet bei Kautzsch[4] gesteht zu, daß MT von V. 6 nur mit dieser Umstellung zu halten ist; Gunkel meint, das dazu nötige spöttische Verständnis von V. 6 „lege der Wortlaut nicht nahe“.

[9] Man verbessere p. 189 Zeile 2 das irrige Citat in „Gesenius-Kautzsch § 90 o“.

das tägliche Brot".[10] — Das יהוה in b in Jahwes Munde könnte man zur Not gelten lassen (so Torrey), obgleich es so dicht neben dem „Ich" des עַמִּי doch nicht leicht ist; ich muß aber bei meinem Vorschlag von 1915, אֹתִי „mich" zu lesen, bleiben. Ich erklärte das überlieferte יהוה dort so, daß man zuerst אתי als Abkürzung für אֶת־יהוה aufgefaßt und so ausgeschrieben, später die unnötige *nota acc.* gestrichen hätte. Sachlich bedeutet das ja keinen Unterschied. — Für קראו habe ich schon 1901 und ebenso 1915 יָרֵאוּ zu lesen vorgeschlagen, „ohne Jahwe (oder „mich") zu fürchten", weil jenes doch für das Fressen des Volkes Jahwes eine gar zu schwache Kennzeichnung wäre, auch, wenn Heiden gemeint sind, wie sich uns ergeben wird, von ihnen ein Anrufen Jahwes nicht erwartet werden kann.[11]

Über V. 4 sind also Torrey und ich der Sache nach vollkommen einverstanden bis auf den einen, freilich grundlegenden Punkt, die Zeitfrage. Torrey versteht V. 4 von der Gegenwart (Who devour my people like bread and call not on the Lord), als Unterlage, wie wir sahen, für den ebenfalls auf die Gegenwart bezüglich hergestellten V. 6, wo dem עָנִי Jahwes Beistand gegen die Übeltäter zugesagt wird. Das aber ist einfach unmöglich, weil es in der Gegenwart nach dem unfehlbaren, auf genauer Prüfung beruhenden Urteil Jahwes (V. 2 f.) fromme Menschen, „Guttäter", überhaupt nicht gibt, „auch nicht einen einzigen". Da nun das von Jahwe mit Affekt gesprochene „mein Volk" in V. 4, und ebenso „der Elende", „dessen Zuflucht Jahwe ist" (so Torreys Text), in V. 6 zweifellos im Gegensatz zu den „Übeltätern" gerechte Menschen sind, die Jahwes Hilfe verdienen — der Text von Ps. 14 5 fügt noch

[10] Bevans geistreiche, noch leichtere Verbesserung אָכַל וְלֶחֶם, der sich Wellhausen (Skizzen und Vorarbeiten VI, 1899, S. 168) angeschlossen hat, halte ich dem Sinne nach für weniger gut, wie ihr denn auch die Stütze der Vss. abgeht. Ganz irre geht Duhm mit der Verdoppelung von יהוה, „Sie essen das Brot Jahwes, Jahwe rufen sie nicht an", wodurch der Psalm zu einer Philippika gegen die Jahwepriester wird, mit denen er nicht das Geringste zu tun hat. Wie Gunkel in seinem Kommentar sich das aneignet und dann weit darüber hinaus den Wortlaut des Psalms verwüstet, das hier zu verfolgen würde zu weit führen.

[11] So jetzt Wutz ohne mich zu nennen; er dürfte es bei Kittel, Bibl. Hebr. (1905) unter *„prpst"* gefunden haben.

„das gerechte Geschlecht“ hinzu, das Torrey streicht — so können V. 4 und V. 6 durchaus nicht von der Gegenwart oder einer nächsten Zukunft reden, die ja solche Menschen überhaupt nicht bietet, sondern nur von einer besseren Vergangenheit, einer Zeit, in der ein Gegensatz zwischen Gerechten und Ungerechten bestand, der dem gerechten Gott Ursache und Möglichkeit bot, auf der einen Seite zu strafen, auf der andren zu beschützen. Diesem Schluß kann man meines Erachtens in keiner Weise ausweichen; es ist schwer begreiflich, wie so viele Ausleger das völlig übersehen. Der Dichter ist wahrlich nicht schuld daran. Unbedingter konnte er die ausnahmslose Sündigkeit in der Gegenwart nicht feststellen, als durch das Gottesurteil in V. 2 f., und die Perfekta יָדְעוּ, als solches bestätigt durch קָרָאוּ in V. 4, dazu in der Fassung von Ps. 53 noch פִּזֵּר und הֱבִישֹׁתָה in V. 6, weisen ebenso wie das פָּחֲדוּ in V. 5 denselben Weg.

Auf ein Ereignis aus der Vergangenheit Israels weist also der kurze Spruch Jahwes V. 4 zurück, und mit diesem Hinweis beantwortet Jahwe, nachdem er die Sachlage auf der ganzen Erde geprüft hat, die Leugnung seiner Existenz seitens des Toren. Dieser kurze Spruch (V. 4) wird in V. 5 f. — auch darüber sind Torrey und ich erfreulicherweise durchaus einverstanden — von dem Dichter gedeutet: wir müssen darauf gefaßt sein, daß es sich um eine gewaltige, Allen bekannte Begebenheit handelt. Damit treten wir an V. 5 heran. Wieder sind wir darin einig, daß das Mehr von Ps. 53 im ersten Halbvers, von LXX auch in Ps. 14 geboten, das לֹא הָיָה פַחַד hinter שָׁם פָּחֲדוּ פַחַד, echt ist und einen ersten Vers von 3 + 2 Hebungen in erwünschter Weise herstellt. Aber in der Deutung des Sätzchens gehn wir weit auseinander. Zwei Möglichkeiten gibt Torrey (p. 189) dafür frei: entweder, daß „der Schrecken“ plötzlich über solche kam, die ohne Befürchtung gewesen waren, oder, daß er so stark war, daß er einen anderen Namen verdient hätte. Er zieht die erstere vor; aber ist das nicht recht nichtssagend, da es doch von jedem Schrecken gilt? Die dritte Deutung, die nächstliegende, erwähnt er nicht, wohl darum, weil sie für den Schrecken ein anderes Subjekt fordert als das von ihm angenommene. Es heißt einfach „wo doch kein Schrek-

ken war", d. h. kein Anlaß, kein Gegenstand des Schreckens.[12] Die hier das Schlimmste fürchteten, sind eben nicht die Übeltäter von V. 4, sondern die von ihnen Vergewaltigten, Jahwes Volk in vergangenen Tagen. Und sie hätten nichts zu fürchten brauchen, weil Jahwe mit ihnen war, ganz wie das der zweite Halbvers in Ps. 14, auch in seiner zweifellos verstümmelten Gestalt, noch deutlich genug sagt: „Denn Jahwe ist [„war"?] in [„mit"?] einem [„dem"?] gerechten Geschlecht." Dieses בְּדוֹר צַדִּיק, das in Ps. 53 fehlt, als falsche Entzifferung eines verdorbenen Textes zu beseitigen, wie Torrey das tut, ist recht übel angebracht. Gerade dieses „gerechten Geschlechts", der gerechten Generation der Vergangenheit, bedürfen wir dringend als Gegensatz zu der gänzlich verderbten Gegenwart von V. 2 f.; die Worte können nicht von dem Überarbeiter stammen, auf den MT von Ps. 14 zurückgeht, weil der folgende Vers zeigt, daß er von diesem Gegensatz keine Ahnung mehr hat, nicht minder auch, weil sie erst Sinn gewinnen, nachdem man aus Ps. 53 die in Ps. 14 verlorenen Worte לֹא הָיָה פַחַד ergänzt hat. — Aber freilich genügt das überlieferte כִּי אֱלֹהִים בְּדוֹר צַדִּיק gerechten Anforderungen durchaus nicht: weder der Form nach, weil wir 3 + 2 Hebungen brauchen, noch nach dem Inhalt, weil der Gemeinplatz „denn Gott ist in einem gerechten Geschlecht" nicht die geschichtliche Begebenheit bezeichnen kann, deren wir hier bedürfen. Schon Dyserinck hatte dafür ein Verbum verlangt und בָּחַר statt בְּדוֹר zu lesen vorgeschlagen. Die Aussage „er erwählte, er entschied sich für" ist vortrefflich, die Änderung spielend leicht; aber das בְּדוֹר, das Geschlecht, die Generation, können wir nicht entbehren. Deshalb schlug ich 1915 vor, בָּחַר vielmehr vor בְּדוֹר zu ergänzen und anzunehmen, daß es eben seiner Ähnlichkeit wegen davor übersehen und ausgefallen sei. Indem ich dann mit Anderen יהוה statt אלהים herstellte, gewann ich in כִּי יהוה בָחַר בְּדוֹר צַדִּיק ein erstes Glied von 4 Hebungen, wie wir das ja auch in V. 4 haben gelten lassen. Dazu fügte ich dann aus 14 6 b das zweite Glied יהוה

[12] Daß פַּחַד nicht nur die Empfindung des Schreckens bezeichnet, sondern auch den Schrecken als Gegenstand, beweisen z. B. Ps. 31 12; Jes. 24 18; Jer. 48 44. So fassen schon LXX den Satz: οὗ οὐκ ἦν φόβος, und Vulg. *ubi non erat* [nicht *fuerat!*] *timor*.

מַחְסֶךָ.[13] Ich sehe heute lieber von dieser Lösung ab, weil damit die Schlußworte von V. 6 in ihrer Doppelgestalt (Ps. 14 und Ps. 53) doppelte Verwendung finden würden, was doch für einen einheitlichen Urtext nicht wohl vorausgesetzt werden darf. Ich bin jetzt überzeugt, daß das בְּדוֹר צַדִּיק von Ps. 14 das nachdrücklich betonte kürzere zweite Glied des Verses bildet, während aus כִּי אֱלֹהִים בָּחַר das längere erste Glied gewonnen werden muß. Ich versuche das, indem ich יהוה nicht für אֱלֹהִים einsetze, sondern davor ergänze, sodaß sich das in Ps. 14 unorganische אֱלֹהִים durch den Ausfall von יהוה leicht erklärt, der Ausfall aber etwa durch die Annahme, daß כי יהוה einmal in כיי abgekürzt und dann das zweite י als Dittographie gestrichen wurde.[14] Für das אלהים meine ich אֱלֹהֶיךָ herstellen zu dürfen, dessen Suffix sich ebenso rechtfertigen wird, wie das gleiche in meinem früheren Vorschlage. Lies also 5 b כִּי יהוה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בָחַר בְּדוֹר צַדִּיק. Die Frage, ob man daraufhin auch in 5 a פָּחַדְתָּ für פָּחֲדוּ herstellen sollte, habe ich schon 1915 aufgeworfen. Das würde den Vorteil haben, daß die Person derer, über die damals der Schrecken kam, nämlich Jahwes Volk, unmißverständlich von der der פֹּעֲלֵי אָוֶן und des יָדְעוּ oder יְדָעוּנִי in V. 4 unterschieden würde. Daß man später diesen Unterschied vergaß und die beiden meinte gleichsetzen zu müssen, wie ja auch Torrey tut, hätte dann die Änderung in פָּחֲדוּ herbeigeführt, und das wäre besonders leicht verständlich, nachdem das לֹא הָיָה פַחַד fortgefallen war. So hat jene Herstellung in der Tat viel für sich. Aber anderseits ist doch das Nebeneinanderstehn zweier dritter Personen von verschiedener Bedeutung eine sehr häufige und an sich unverdächtige Erscheinung, und daß das Geschlecht der Vorzeit zuerst in der 3. Person heraufgerufen wäre mit dem unbestimmten „man“, dann durch das „Du“ eindringlich gleichgesetzt würde mit dem Israel der Gegenwart, kann man sich recht wohl gefallen lassen. Man wird sich daher eine Änderung der einhellig bezeugten Lesung ersparen dürfen.

[13] Für die Verwandlung des מַחְסֵהוּ in מַחְסֶךָ wird sich weiterhin der Grund ergeben.

[14] Daß LXX אca für אֱלֹהִים κύριος ὁ θεός bietet, ist dafür natürlich nur eine recht schwache Stütze.

Wir kehren nun, nachdem wir uns den Weg dazu gebahnt, zu V. 6[15] zurück, von dem wir ausgegangen sind. Daß hier, wo Ps. 14 und Ps. 53 am weitesten auseinandergehn, beide Texte nur verschiedene Ausdeutungen desselben ursprünglichen Wortlauts sind, darüber sind nicht nur Torrey und ich, sondern so ziemlich alle Ausleger einverstanden. Jeder der beiden Texte weist dem andren gegenüber eine kleine Lücke auf. Setzen wir das einleitende כִּי אֱלֹהִים von Ps. 53 denselben Worten in Ps. 14 5 b gleich, was alles für sich hat, so fehlen in Ps. 53 nur die Worte בְּדוֹר צַדִּיק, in Ps. 14 nur das einzige Wort פִּזָּר des andren Textes. Dagegen entsprechen einander vollkommen die Wortreihen:

Ps. 14 עֲצַת עָנִי תָּבִישׁוּ כִּי יהוה מַחְסֵהוּ und
Ps. 53 עַצְמוֹת חֹנֵךְ הֲבִישֹׁתָה כִּי אֱלֹהִים מְאָסָם

Daß von diesen die erste keinen verständigen Sinn gibt, den ursprünglichen Wortlaut des Psalms also nicht darstellen kann, daß auch die Versuche einer Herstellung auf dieser Grundlage zu nichts führen, haben wir oben gesehen. Prüfen wir nun den Wortlaut von Ps. 53: „Denn Gott — natürlich ursprünglich „Jahwe“ — verstreute die Gebeine deines Belagerers: du machtest zu Schanden, weil Gott — „Jahwe“, vgl. Ps. 14 — sie verworfen hatte.“ Mit einem “But this is no place for ‘scattering bones’“ erledigt Torrey (p. 190) diesen Wortlaut. Immerhin ist, wie wir sahen, hinter V. 4 und 5 hier jedenfalls die gewiesene Stelle für eine große Rettungstat Jahwes an dem gerechten Geschlecht Israels gegenüber einem übermächtigen, Jahwe nicht fürchtenden Feinde in der Vergangenheit: es wird sich also nur fragen, ob dafür Ps. 53 6 den richtigen Ausdruck bietet, und weiter, ob sich die gemeinte Begebenheit festlegen läßt. Das Erstere bezweifelt Torrey nicht, und in der Tat sind die Beweise dafür leicht beizubringen. Daß חנה im Sinne „belagern“ sonst mit עַל verbunden wird, steht nicht im Wege; dasselbe gilt von קום, und doch wird ein abgekürztes קָמַי usw. (Ps. 18 40, 49; 44 6; 74 23) anstandslos neben קָמִים עָלַי usw. (z. B. Ps. 3 2; 92 12; Dt. 28 7) gebraucht. Das פִּזַּר עצמות aber hat sein

[15] Nach der Zählung von Ps. 14; in Ps. 53 ist es V. 6 b.

genaues Seitenstück an Ps. 141 7; mit זֶרֶה statt פִּזַּר an Hes. 6 5; mit אֹיְבֶיךָ statt עצמות an Ps. 89 11. Sachlich aber könnte man wohl keinen Bericht ersinnen, der dieser Aussage besser entspräche, als der über das Scheitern der Belagerung Jerusalems durch Sanherib von Assyrien im Jahre 701 unter König Hiskia von Juda (2 Kön. 19 25 = Jes. 37 36): „In dieser Nacht aber zog der Engel Jahwes aus und schlug im Lager Assurs 185000 Mann, und als man am Morgen aufstand, waren sie alle tote Leichname.“ Das ist die einzige Belagerung Jerusalems, und damit Israels, für die solche Rettungstat in Betracht kommt, und sie tritt für das angesiedelte Volk und die Königszeit ebenbürtig neben die andre der Ausführung aus Ägypten. Ob der Bericht den geschichtlichen Tatsachen entspricht, oder ob die Sage sich ihrer bemächtigt und sie ausgeschmückt hat, ist ganz gleichgültig, weil für die Folgezeit, der der Psalm angehört, nur die Fassung der Überlieferung in Betracht kommt. Und ebenso gleichgültig ist es, daß Jesaja gegen das Geschlecht der Zeit Hiskias schwere Anklagen richtet (vgl. Kap. 1; Kap. 22 1–14 usw.) — deren Zeit erst die geschichtliche Kritik bestimmen muß — da sicher für die Überzeugung der Gemeinde das theokratische Urteil des Deuteronomisten in 2 Kön. 18 5–7 allein bestimmend und entscheidend war, durch das mit dem frömmsten aller Könige Judas auch das Volk in seinen Tagen zum gerechten Geschlechte wird. Diesen völlig unmißverständlichen Wortlaut hat Wellhausen ins Allgemeine verflüchtigt, indem er — im Anschluß an Cappellus und Schleusner — für חנך nach LXX ἀνθρωπαρέσκων חָנֵף zu lesen vorschlug, was fast alle Neueren sich aneignen, sei es für den Urtext, sei es wenigstens für LXX.[16] Ich kann beides nicht für glücklich halten. Ich verstehe nicht, wie Wellhausen dafür Hi. 34 30; 36 13 anführen, Kittel z. B. diese Stellen unter ausdrücklicher Verweisung auf deren LXX-Wiedergabe wiederholen kann; während doch LXX an beiden Stellen חָנֵף mit ὑποκριτής wiedergibt.[17] Schon 1901 habe ich hervorgehoben, daß das ἀνθρωπαρέσκων

[16] Ausnahmen von beidem z. B. König und Wutz.

[17] Denkt Wellhausen etwa daran, daß ἀνθρωπάρεσκος in Ps. Sal. 8 8, 10 neben ἐν ὑποκρίσει ζῶντες, ἁμαρτωλοί und παράνομοι steht? Er nennt die Stellen nicht.

nur die beiden ersten Buchstaben von חנך wiedergebe — sei es mit oder ohne ך als Suffix — nicht auch das פ von חָנֵף, da es auf den Stamm חנן zurückgehe, vgl. ἀρέσκειαι für חֵן in Spr. 31 30. Dasselbe ergibt sich, wenn man es mit Wutz auf ein aramäisches und neuhebräisches הנה (הנא) zurückführt, wofür er ἀρέσει für יָאֵנֶה Spr. 12 21 bietet. Der Sache nach ist nicht der geringste Grund, das überlieferte חֹנָךְ anzuzweifeln; denn es bietet genau, was der Zusammenhang fordert, die große Rettungstat in der Vergangenheit. — Fragen kann man, wie das Suffix von חנך zu fassen ist. Möglich wäre die 2. fem. sing. im eigentlichsten Sinne, als Anrede an Jerusalem, die belagerte Stadt, aber auch die 2. masc. sing. חֹנָךְ, i. p. חֹנָךְ, an das Volk und Geschlecht (עַמִּי in V. 4, דּוֹר in V. 5) sich richtend, das in ihr belagert wurde, und ebenso die 2. sing. beider Geschlechter am Plural, חֹנַ[י]ךְ oder חֹנָ[י]ךְ auf die Mehrzahl der Belagerer gehend. Diese letzte Auffassung scheint durch das מִאָסָם am Ende des Verses empfohlen zu werden; dennoch halte ich die zweite Möglichkeit, eben wegen der Rückbeziehung auf V. 4 und 5, für die wahrscheinlichste; sie wäre vollends als die allein richtige erwiesen, wenn das folgende הֲבִישֹׁתָה Billigung verdiente. Neigte man dazu, so würde man doch הֲבִישֹׁתָם herstellen müssen, weil sonst das Objekt fehlt. Aber das Volk hat damals den Belagerer nicht zu Schanden gemacht; es lag untätig hinter den Mauern, während Jahwe durch seinen Engel eingriff. Schon 1901 habe ich deshalb הבישו verbessert, „sie [die Belagerer, was auch nach der Einzahl vorher gestattet ist] wurden zu Schanden.“ Nichts ist leichter als das, weil man nur das Präformativ ה unsrer Lesart, das für die Vergangenheit wie für die 3. Person gleich unerläßlich ist, mit dem Afformativ aus תָּבִישׁוּ in Ps. 14 zu verbinden braucht.

Und nun die Versform des so gewonnenen V. 6. Als das zweite Versglied von zwei Hebungen kann nur, wie ich schon 1915 festgestellt habe, הבישו כִּי מִאָסָם in Betracht kommen und ist in dieser kurzen, schlagenden Entgegensetzung vortrefflich. Das verdeutlichende אֱלֹהִים hinter כִּי, das in dem יהוה von Ps. 14 Seitenstück und Vorlage hat, wird schon früh in Verkennnung der Versform eingedrungen sein. Für den ersten Halbvers würde פֹּזַר עַצְמוֹת חֹנָךְ mit seinen drei Hebungen ge-

nügen; doch kann man, weil vier Hebungen ausnahmsweise möglich sind (vgl. 4 b α), das vorausgehende אֱלֹהִים (ursprünglich יהוה) ohne das כִּי festhalten. Man braucht nur anzunehmen — was ohnehin das Wahrscheinlichste ist — daß in Ps. 53 das Auge des Abschreibers von dem כי יהוה oder כי אלהים vor בדור (14 5) unmittelbar auf den Gottesnamen zu Anfang von V. 6 übergesprungen sei.[18]

Mit dem so hergestellten Verse geht der Gedankengang des Gedichtes zu Ende: Jahwe hat seinem Volke in der Vergangenheit, als er einem gerechten Geschlecht begegnete, treulich und machtvoll beigestanden. — Dazu ergänzt sich stillschweigend der Schluß, daß, wenn er sein Volk in der Gegenwart ohne Hülfe lasse, die allgemeine Verderbnis, die Jahwe in V. 2 f. festgestellt hat, die Schuld trage, und daraus folgt dann ebenso stillschweigend die Mahnung, zu der alten Gerechtigkeit zurückzukehren, um neuen Heils teilhaftig zu werden. Ich habe deshalb in meinem Büchlein „Die schönsten Psalmen" unsren Psalm überschrieben „Gottes gerechte Vergeltung wartet auf ein gerechtes Geschlecht", und habe, wie schon 1901, auf die nachexilischen Propheten Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi verwiesen, die genau diesen Gedankengang, und lückenlos, auch mit der Schlußfolgerung, aufweisen. Bei unsrem Psalm könnte man geradezu auf unvollständige Überlieferung des Liedes schließen, die ja im Psalmenbuche keineswegs ohne Beispiele wäre. Aber es ist doch auch durchaus möglich, daß der Dichter gedacht hat „*Sapienti sat*", und es darum bei dem kräftigen, dramatischen Schluß mit dem Untergang der Feinde hat bewenden lassen.

[18] Gunkel (S. 234) sagt zu V. 6: „Budde hat in Abfall von der schon längst gewonnenen Erkenntnis, daß es sich hier um zwei aus demselben Urtext geflossene Varianten handelt, versucht, durch Nebeneinanderstellen der Worte einen neuen Text zu gewinnen." Das heißt doch mit dem, was ich geboten habe, sich recht leichthin abfinden, trifft auch keineswegs den Tatbestand, da ich für den größten Teil der Paralleltexte bei der alten Erkenntnis bleibe. Das gilt heute noch mehr, da ich auf das damals noch neben כי יהוה מאסם verwendete כי יהוה מחסהו von Ps. 14 ganz verzichte. Daß ich mich bei der Wiederherstellung wie Duhm „an den scheinbar leichteren Text von Ps. 14 gehalten" hätte, ist geradezu eine Umkehrung des wahren Tatbestands.

Aber sehr begreiflich ist es in jedem Falle, daß, als das Gedicht in gottesdienstlichen Gebrauch genommen wurde — vgl. das למנצח vor beiden Texten und weiteres vor Ps. 53 — man am Schluß eine liturgische Formel anfügte, einen Stoßseufzer, den die Gemeinde mitempfinden konnte. Ich dürfte in neuerer Zeit der Erste gewesen sein, der diese Erklärung von V. 7 (Th. Lit. Zt. 1896, Sp. 561) in der Anzeige von Wellhausens Psalmen wieder vortrug.[19] Daß Torrey sie sich nicht aneignet,[20] ist um so schwerer zu verstehn, da er metrische Abweichung zugeben muß. Und doch ist auch, was er in dieser Beziehung feststellt, ein 3 + 2; 4 + 2 ‖ 2, gewiß nicht das Richtige, sondern einzig und allein was Duhm gibt, „drei vierhebige (oder sechs zweihebige) Stichen“,[21] wovon ich die erstere Auffassung für die natürlichere halte. Sicher bildet מִי יִתֵּן מִצִּיּוֹן nicht, wie Torrey zählt, drei, sondern nur zwei Hebungen; sicher fallen die tiefen Einschnitte bei יִשְׂרָאֵל und עַמּוֹ. In drei eindringlich breiten Zeilen, ohne Zweifel nach neuer musikalischer Weise, wird dieser Zusatzvers bei der Tempelaufführung den Psalm feierlich abgeschlossen haben.

Seine, auch von Andren schon vertretene, abweichende metrische Abteilung in zwei Ḳina-Verse und ein alleinstehendes kürzeres Glied stützt Torrey durch die Berufung auf V. 3, der, beim ersten Haupteinschnitt des Psalms, ebenfalls das Schema 3 | 2 ‖ 2 darbiete. Da uns ohnehin die ersten drei Verse für die Untersuchung noch übrig bleiben, können wir dem sofort nachgehn. Zunächst erscheint es mir sehr fraglich, ob man wirklich dort, am Schluß von V. 3, den ersten tiefen Einschnitt ansetzen darf. Bilden doch — darüber sind wir einverstanden — die beiden unter V. 4 vereinigten Verse den Ausspruch, der

19 Früher nannte schon Olshausen (1853) den Vers ein Epiphonem und berief sich dafür auf Köster.

20 Duhm vertritt sie entschieden, ebenso Bertholet; Kittel gibt sie je nach der Auslegung frei; selbst König läßt die spätere Hinzufügung von V. 7 offen; Gunkel meint, er könnte vielleicht, aber müsse nicht Zusatz sein.

21 In der zweiten Auflage: „drei zweihebige Disticha.“

sich Jahwe entringt, nachdem er beim Auslugen aus dem Himmel die Beschaffenheit der Menschenkinder festgestellt hat. Wir würden also den ersten Teil des Gedichts mit dem Doppelpunkt der Einführung dieser direkten Rede abschließen und damit das Ergebnis von der Untersuchung loslösen. Dazu ist umsoweniger ein Grund einzusehen, da Torrey (p. 191) — zu meiner großen Freude — mit mir der Meinung ist, daß die Hebräische Dichtung im allgemeinen nicht strophisch ist, regelmäßige Strophen hier also nicht gesucht zu werden brauchen. Will man daher einteilen und Einschnitte machen, so darf es nur nach dem Inhalt geschehen, und dann stellt sich, ganz nach den *dramatis personae*, zunächst V. 1 mit dem Toren auf eigne Füße, sodann V. 2–4 mit dem Eingreifen Jahwes, und endlich V. 5, 6 mit der Deutung des Dichters.

Aber nicht nur das Gewicht der Stelle muß ich bei V. 3 anzweifeln, sondern auch die richtige Beobachtung des Maßes. Die zweite der von Torrey unterschiedenen Zeilen, אֵין עֹשֵׂה טוֹב, hat nicht zwei Hebungen, sondern drei, sodaß mit ihr ein neuer Ḳina-Vers beginnt und bis zum Versschluß zu Ende läuft. Damit berichtige ich mich selbst; denn noch 1915 schlug ich vor, zur Vervollständigung der längeren Zeile etwa בָּאָרֶץ zu ergänzen, was zwischen dem ב und א von טוב und אין übersehen wäre. In Wirklichkeit muß das אֵין durchaus eine Tonsilbe bilden, schon darum, weil es das in der kürzeren Zeile אֵין גַּם אֶחָד zweifellos tut, und nicht minder in dem אֵין אֱלֹהִים von V. 1; aber auch, weil auf ihm dem Sinne nach der Hauptnachdruck der ganzen Zeile ruht. Daß dann zwei Tonsilben zusammenstoßen, erhöht nur den Nachdruck, findet sich auch ebenso am Anfang des Verses. So bildet 3 b zweifellos einen vollen Vers, und es bleibt davor in 3 a ein Bestand von vier Hebungen, der ganz von selbst in zwei vollständige, unter sich parallele Glieder, also in 2 Zweier, zerfällt. Da wir hier nur 3 + 2 brauchen und erwarten können, so bildet יַחְדָּו נֶאֱלָחוּ mit Sicherheit das zweite, kürzere Glied, aber von dem ersten muß die dritte Hebung verloren sein, da sowohl Ps. 14 mit הַכֹּל סָר wie Ps. 53 mit כֻּלּוֹ סָג nur noch zwei bieten. Das habe ich schon 1915 festgestellt und gewann damals aus beiden הַכֹּל נָסוֹג אָחוֹר, wovon dann das letzte Wort vor יַחְדָּו übersehen wäre:

gewiß eine äußerst leichte Annahme.[22] Da aber נָסוֹג אָחוֹר weit überwiegend von passivem Mißerfolg verwendet wird — nur einmal Ps. 44 19 לֹא נָסוֹג אָחוֹר לִבֵּנוּ — so wird man besser tun, entweder mit der einzigen Stelle Zeph. 1 9 נָסַג מֵאַחֲרָו zu lesen, oder besser noch nach vielen Stellen סָר מֵאַחֲרָו. Daß dieses אחרו dem darauf folgenden יחדו fast vollkommen gleich ist, macht diese Herstellung noch leichter als jene erste; durch beide aber wird der Ausdruck in der erwünschtesten Weise vollständiger und deutlicher: „abgefallen“ nicht *in abstracto*, sondern „von Gott“, was hinter dem „nach Gott Fragen“ in V. 2 durchaus erwartet werden muß.

V. 2 ist bis auf das selbstverständliche אֱלֹהִים der ersten Zeile in Ps. 53 buchstäblich gleich überliefert. Gegen beide Texte wird man gut tun, das אֶת־ in b zu streichen, was auch Torrey freigibt. Nicht nur will der zweite Halbvers jedesmal so leicht gehalten sein wie irgend möglich; sondern es ist auch jede Spur von Determination vom Übel, da es sich hier nicht um Jahwe insbesondere, sondern um Gottheit als solche handelt. Aber Jahwe ist es, der in dem ersten Fünfer vom Himmel auslugt, „zum Himmelsfenster“ möchte man sagen, nach dem bezeichnendsten Gebrauch des Verbums (Gen. 26 8; 2 Kön. 9 30, 32; Niph. Ri. 5 28; 2 Sam. 6 16; Spr. 7 6; 1 Chr. 15 29). Gern erführe man deutlicher, was ihn zu solch unmittelbarem, auf den Augenblick festgelegten Eingreifen veranlaßte — denn daß das הִשְׁקִיף durchaus als historisches Tempus verstanden werden muß, wie es auch Torrey wiedergibt, kann ja keinen Augenblick zweifelhaft sein — vielleicht gibt uns V. 1 etwas mehr Aufschluß darüber, als es scheint.

V. 1 soll ohne Zweifel ebenso, wie nach unsrem Ergebnis jeder der sechs Verse des ursprünglichen Gedichtes, zwei Ḳina-Verse, d. i. zwei Fünfer von 3 + 2, bringen. Von ihnen ist der erste in 1 a tadellos, ist auch überall genau übereinstimmend überliefert. Anders der zweite, wo MT von Ps. 53 und LXX zu beiden Psalmen vor הִתְעִיבוּ ein וְ einfügen — es fehlt in

[22] Bertholet schlägt die Ergänzung eines Wortes, „etwa 'ăḥôr“, vor, ohne meines Vorgangs Erwähnung zu tun; Mowinckel (III, S. 60) verbessert נָסוֹג אָחוֹר, ebenfalls ohne mich zu nennen.

einigen hebräischen Handschriften — und Ps. 53 עָוֶל statt עֲלִילָה liest, was auch LXX durch ἀδικίαις statt ἐπιτηδεύμασιν bezeugt. In beiden Fällen bin ich mit Torrey einverstanden, daß Ps. 14 MT den besseren Text bietet, nicht nur rhythmisch, sondern auch dem Sinne nach; denn הִתְעִיבוּ steigert die Aussage wirksamer ohne Verbindung, und עֲלִילָה erweitert die Aussage in wünschenswerter Weise. Unwillkürlich dürfte das landläufige עָוֶל dafür aus der Feder geflossen sein,[23] während doch für עֲלִילָה Zeph. 3 7 erwünschtes Zeugnis ablegt. Für b β gibt es keine Abweichung; so scheint alles in Ordnung zu sein, und alle beruhigen sich dabei. Das habe ich früher auch getan; was den Rhythmus betrifft, sogar noch 1915. Aber der ist unbedingt falsch; denn nur zwei Hebungen sind zulässig, und daß die Worte אֵין עֹשֵׂה טוֹב eine dreihebige Zeile ausmachen, haben wir an V. 3 b α mit Sicherheit gesehen und durch den Ton für אֵין in 3 b β und 1 a bestätigt gefunden. Daß vollends der gleiche Satz in 3 b α ein längeres, dreihebiges, und in 1 b ein kürzeres, zweihebiges Glied bei demselben Dichter und in demselben Gedichte ausmachen sollte, ist völlig ausgeschlossen. Somit kann dieser Satz in V. 1 nicht ursprünglicher Text sein. Das folgt freilich aus allem Übrigen in gleicher Weise. Kann ein Dichter von dem Range des unsrigen dem Ergebnis der Prüfung Jahwes in V. 3 derart vorgreifen; wird er es abschwächen durch das Vorausgehn des gleichen Urteils aus Menschenmund? Vielmehr wird eine spätere Hand das unfehlbare Urteil aus V. 3 hierher zurückgetragen haben — ob bloß aus einer gewissen Gedankenlosigkeit und Liebedienerei oder, weil man Anstoß an dem dadurch ersetzten Wortlaut nahm, mag noch gefragt werden. Daß es dabei mit dem Rhythmus, falls man davon noch Bescheid wußte, nicht zu genau genommen wurde, versteht sich von selbst. Aber der Prozeß der „systematischen Konformierung", wie Wellhausen ähnliches einmal genannt hat, setzt sich dann in LXX fort, da sie am Schluß von 14 1 vollends noch οὐκ ἔστιν ἕως ἑνός aus V. 3 hinzufügt und damit deutlich die Quelle weist, aus der auch die vorhergehende Zeile geflossen ist.

[23] Daß עֲלִילָה „eine Erleichterung sein kann" (Gunkel), muß ich für sehr unwahrscheinlich halten.

Nur aus dem Sinne hatte ich 1915 für die Zeile einen andren Wortlaut erschlossen, hatte dem aber leider in ZAW eine so kurze Fassung gegeben, daß das Recht, ja die Notwendigkeit dieser Schlußfolgerung schwerlich ausreichend klar geworden ist. Es wird nötig sein, die Auslegung des Eingangsverses *ab ovo* aufzuwickeln, da ich der Überzeugung bin, daß die heutige Auslegung schon die Grundfrage für ihn falsch beantwortet. Was ist in ihm das *prius*, was das *posterius*, was das Gegebene, was die daraus gezogene Folgerung? Wird all der Frevel begangen, weil man Gott leugnet und deshalb der Straflosigkeit gewiß ist, oder zieht man den Schluß, daß es keinen Gott gebe, daraus, daß soviel Frevel straflos verübt wird? Alle Auslegungen, die mir zur Hand sind, treten für die erstere Auffassung ein, und doch spricht schon der Form nach alles dagegen. „Der Tor", in der Einzahl, denkt, es sei kein Gott, aber die da „verderbt, ja abscheulich handeln" stehn in der Mehrzahl. Wie soll dann נָבָל dazu das Subjekt sein? Natürlich könnte das Wort auch kollektiv gebraucht werden; aber vorkommen tut das doch nirgends, wohl aber, wo die Mehrzahl gemeint ist, נְבָלִים (2 Sam. 13 13; Hes. 13 3) und נְבָלוֹת (Hi. 2 10), oder בְּנֵי נָבָל (Hi. 30 8). Und wenn vollends so große Zweideutigkeit entstehn konnte wie hier, wo man doch zweifellos beim Wechel des *numerus* unter den Pluralformen das unbestimmte Subjekt „sie" oder „man" verstehn konnte (Ges.-Kautzsch § 144 f): warum bediente sich der Dichter nicht der Mehrzahl, wenn er „die Toren"[24] zugleich als die Übeltäter des zweiten Fünfers einführen wollte? Und weiter gibt man sich die größte Mühe zu beweisen, daß es sich keineswegs um theoretische Skepsis handle, daß נָבָל nicht bloß der Tor sei, sondern auch anderwärts frevelhaft handle.[25] Gewiß kann die Torheit auch dahin auslaufen; aber נָבָל bezeichnet das an sich nicht, und wo es grundlegend eingeführt wird wie hier, sollte man doch meinen, daß es bei dem Begriff bliebe und der Hörer oder Leser nicht nutzlos in die Irre geführt würde. Jedenfalls ist

[24] So übersetzen verschiedene Ausleger an unsrer Stelle, König in demselben Sinne „Jeder Tor".

[25] Hitzig übersetzt einfach „Der Ruchlose", Mowinckel (V, S. 17) „der Frevler".

in der Stelle, die man immer wieder zum Beweise anführt, daß die Gottesleugnung das *prius*, das vermeintlich straflose Freveln die Folgerung daraus sei, Ps. 10 4, 11, das Subjekt dafür nicht נָבָל, sondern רָשָׁע (V. 4 zu Anfang, alles Folgende, auch das Gottvergessen von V. 11 noch mit beherrschend). Und wenn die abstrakte Möglichkeit dieser Auffassung durch Ps. 10 4 zweifellos bewiesen ist, so bedenke man doch, daß auch ihr die umgekehrte Schlußfolge bereits voraufgegangen sein muß. Denn aus der Beobachtung, daß so viele Frevel unbestraft bleiben, hat ja der רָשָׁע erst den Schluß gezogen, daß es gar keinen rächenden Gott gebe, daß also auch er ungestraft sündigen könne. Das Ursprüngliche ist also jedenfalls dieser Schluß, die Leugnung Gottes aus der großen Zahl der unbestraften Frevel, und der kann doch auch gezogen werden, ohne daß er zu ruchloser Ausnutzung führt, oder gezogen sein, ehe es dazu kommt: so also, daß, der ihn zieht, ein Tor bleibt und nicht zum Frevler wird. Wozu dann diese Zweideutigkeit?

Vor allen Dingen aber: wenn hier als der alles beherrschende Hauptsatz die törichte Überzeugung eingeführt wird, daß es keinen Gott gebe, so muß man durchaus erwarten, daß der Grund, auf dem sie beruht, nicht verschwiegen wird. Daß der im ganzen Alten Testament nicht etwa theoretischer Natur ist, sondern rein praktischer, die Beobachtung der Straflosigkeit so vieler Sünden und Verbrechen, die selbst die frommen Sänger von Ps. 49 und 73 und einen Hiob ins Wanken brachte; daß es sich um eben diese Not auch in unsrem Psalm handelt: darüber sind alle Ausleger einverstanden, und davon haben wir uns bei der Auslegung aller folgenden Verse ausreichend überzeugt. Aber grundlegend ausgesprochen kann es doch nur dann sein, wenn der Tor, der zu dieser Überzeugung gekommen ist, mit seinem „Es gibt keinen Gott“ noch nicht zu Ende ist, sondern weiter redet, sodaß das „Verderbt- und Abscheulichhandeln“ von 1 b nicht sein Tun bezeichnet, sondern seine Beobachtung.[26] Dafür könnte man sich zur Not selbst

[26] Ich finde dieses Verständnis in keiner einzigen der mir vorliegenden Auslegungen. Auch G. F. Moore (Judaism I, p. 360, l. 3 f.) sieht augenscheinlich in dem Toren von 1 a auch die Frevler von 1 b.

mit dem überlieferten Text zufrieden geben. Wenn wirklich die gesamte Menschheit verderbt und abscheulich handelt, wie 1 b β es jetzt ausspricht, so kann man sich nicht wundern, wenn, der das beobachtet, zu dem Schluß gelangt, es müsse etwas im Weltregiment nicht in Ordnung sein, wohl gar der Weltenrichter fehlen. Aber freilich, daß ausgerechnet ein Tor zu einem so strengen sittlichen Urteil gelangen sollte, einem Urteil, das mit dem des prüfenden Weltengottes in V. 3 übereinkommt, fällt schwer zu glauben, und sicherlich hat dies vor allem dazu geführt, 1 b nicht als das Urteil des Toren, sondern als die Aussage des Dichters über ihn aufzufassen.

Was dem recht verstandenen Text von V. 1 fehlt, ist die Ergänzung der Beobachtung „Verderbt, abscheulich handeln sie" durch die andre, daß sich der strafende Richter dafür vermissen läßt; erst aus dieser Gegenüberstellung fließt der Schluß, daß es keinen Gott gebe. Aber nicht nur als Grundlage für 1 a muß diese Feststellung im Munde des Toren gefordert werden, sondern ebenso für V. 2. Denn geht jener törichte Schluß fehl, gibt es dennoch einen Gott, so enthält eben derselbe, für V. 1 zu fordernde Satz gegen diesen Gott die Anklage, daß er seine Schuldigkeit nicht tue. Mit dieser Anklage ringen die Sänger von Ps. 49 und 73.[27] Nun ist aber gerade diese Anklage hier unentbehrlich, weil nur sie das Eingreifen Jahwes in V. 2–4 zu erklären vermag. „Wie, sollte ich wirklich meine Pflicht versäumt haben? Da muß ich doch gleich einmal zusehen!" — Das ist, in der vollen anthropopathischen Fassung, wie sie sich hier von selbst versteht, die Erwägung, die Jahwe veranlaßt, ans Himmelfenster zu treten und seine Augen über die Menschenwelt schweifen zu lassen. Ganz von selbst ergibt sich hier ein merkwürdiges Gegenstück zu dem Ringen Abrahams mit Jahwe um mögliche Gerechte in Sodom und Gomorrha (Gen. 19 23 ff.): dort Verschonung, wenn sich solche finden, hier gerechtes Gericht über die Schuldigen, wenn vergewaltigte Gerechte es verdienen. Um dieses Zurhandsein

27 Lies vor allem Ps. 73 15: בָּגָדְתָּ statt: בָּגָדְתִּי, einer ängstlichen Verschlimmbesserung; vgl. meinen Aufsatz ZAW 1915 und schon meine Anzeige Theol. Lit. Zt. 24. 10. 1896. So jetzt auch Gunkel.

Jahwes zu erklären, dessen Inderluftstehn in dem überlieferten Texte man sich in wahrhaft rührender Weise bisher hat gefallen lassen, muß in V. 1 durchaus diese Anklage vorausgehn. Selbst dann noch, wenn des Toren Mund ihr wirklich Ausdruck gegeben hat, ist, daß Jahwe ihr Folge gibt, ein Beweis reichlich so großer Langmut, wie man sie stets an seiner Verhandlung mit Abraham bewundert hat.

Nun haben wir aber oben (S. 176) mit Sicherheit gesehen, daß die letzte Zeile von V. 1, אֵין עֹשֵׂה טוֹב schon um ihrer Länge willen nicht ursprünglich sein kann, sondern, aus V. 3 entlehnt, einen andren Wortlaut ersetzt haben muß. Dieser verlorene Wortlaut muß jene Eventualanklage, die andre Möglichkeit neben der törichten Leugnung Gottes, enthalten haben; für ihren Ausdruck aber steht uns der Wegweiser zu Gebote, daß sie nur zwei Hebungen messen darf. Diese beiden Zielpunkte leiteten mich bei dem Wagnis, eine Fassung für die verlorene Zeile vorzuschlagen — es mußte gewagt sein, um die Möglichkeit zu erweisen — und so bot ich dafür 1915 die Worte אֵין שָׂם לֵב,[28] „keiner achtet darauf", „ohne daß wer Acht gibt." Auch heute weiß ich nichts Besseres vorzuschlagen: das Sätzchen entspricht meiner Überzeugung nach allen Anforderungen. Auf das Überhandnehmen des Frevels Achten heißt es gebührend heimsuchen. Das kann nur Gott und muß es tun: findet sich niemand dafür, so gibt es eben keinen Gott. — Der Bestand an Buchstaben ist dem überlieferten אֵין עֹשֵׂה טוֹב so ähnlich, daß man fast einen Unfall für dessen Eintreten verantwortlich machen könnte. Aber anderseits auch wieder war dieser Wortlaut, sobald man 1 b dem Dichter statt dem Toren in den Mund legte — und dies Mißverständnis dürfte schon sehr früh eingerissen sein — so unmöglich, daß eine Änderung, vermeintlich Berichtigung, durchaus notwendig erschien. Wie konnte derselbe Dichter, der in V. 2–4 Jahwe als gewissenhaften Untersuchungsrichter einführte, eben vorher behaupten, er kümmere sich nicht um den sittlichen Zustand des Menschengeschlechts? Man konnte nicht fehlgehn, wenn man

[28] Die Wendung genau so, ohne folgende Präposition, Jes. 41 22; Hes. 44 5; Hagg. 2 15, 18, richtig verbessert Richt. 19 30.

dafür das Ergebnis seiner Untersuchung einsetzte, aus dem der vorgefundene Satz wohl einfach durch Textschaden entstanden zu sein scheinen mochte. — So bleibe ich denn bei meinem Vorschlag, bis ein besserer dafür geboten wird.[29]

Und nun noch ein letzter Schritt, ebenfalls ganz gegen das Herkommen, wenn auch ohne eine Änderung. Gelegentlich wird betont, daß אָמַר in V. 1 *tempus historicum* ist,[30] wenn auch die Meisten ruhig beim Präsens bleiben, ohne das auch nur zu entschuldigen, und dessen muß auch ich selbst mich anklagen. Sicher sind jene im Recht; aber was daraus mit Notwendigkeit folgt, habe ich nur bei dem ältesten von ihnen gefunden. Das geschichtliche Tempus „Es sprach" berichtet von einer einmaligen Handlung; die einmalige Handlung aber will von einem einmaligen, einheitlichen Subjekt vollzogen sein, steht sie in der Einzahl, von einem Individuum. So zweifellos also נָבָל in der Dichtung die Bedeutung von הַנָּבָל haben könnte, so sicher heißt es hier nicht „der Tor", d. h. der Tor als Gattung oder Typus, daher füglich „jeder Tor" (König) oder „die Toren", sondern „ein Tor", der betreffende, von dem das אָמַר berichtet.[31] Und das ist nicht, wie Olshausen übersetzt und auslegt, „*ein* (bestimmter und allen Zeitgenossen wohl bekannter) *Tor*" — er meint, ein gottloser Herrscher oder Heerführer — vielmehr kennt ihn kein Mensch, weil er sich ja hütet seine Gottesleugnung auszusprechen, sondern nur bei sich selber geredet, d. h. gedacht hat. Nur Jahwe, der ins Verborgene sieht, der auch die Gedanken der Menschen liest und hört, der hats vernommen, und so gibt er dem Gedangengang jenes Toren durch seine Untersuchung unmittelbare Folge. Der Dichter aber, als der Seher, dem Einblick in Jahwes Rat vergönnt

[29] Gebucht wird mein Vorschlag, und daß ich den ganzen Vers als Rede des Toren denke, von Gunkel, ohne ein Urteil darüber. König führt einen halben Satz aus meinen „Schönsten Psalmen" (S. 102) über meine Auffassung von V. 1 an und stellt dann fest, wie „jedermann sieht, daß diese Behauptung keine Grundlage im Texte besitzt", ohne dem Leser zu verraten, daß ich eben auf Änderung des Textes bestehe. — Andre Erwähnungen meiner Auffassung sind mir nicht begegnet.

[30] LXX Εἶπεν, Vulg. *Dixit*, Olshausen „dachte", Wellhausen „thought", Kautzsch[3] „Es sprach", König „Gesprochen hat".

[31] So richtig LXX Εἶπεν ἄφρων, nicht ὁ ἄφρων.

worden ist (1 Kön. 22 19; Hi. 15 8), der hat beides gehört und gesehen; er berichtet Jahwes Spruch (V. 4) und übernimmt dann selbst dessen Auslegung (V. 5, 6):

Gottes gerechte Vergeltung wartet auf ein gerechtes Geschlecht!

Wie sehr der Psalm durch diese Auffassung und leichte Herstellung an dramatischer Kraft und Schönheit gewinnt, das darf ich wohl zum Schluß betonen und der Hoffnung Ausdruck geben, daß es hie und da möchte nachempfunden werden. Um das zu erleichtern, gebe ich ebenso wie Torrey den gewonnenen Text und seine Übersetzung im Zusammenhang. Im ersteren mache ich die Abweichungen von beiden Textgestalten durch Vokalisierung kenntlich. Die Übersetzung wird sich Mühe geben, dem Tonfall des Urtextes gerecht zu werden.

1 אמר נבל בלבו | אין אלהים ‖
השחיתו התעיבו עלילה | אין שֹׂם לֵב ‖

2 יהוה משמים השקיף | על בני אדם ‖
לראות היש משכיל | דרש [-] אלהים ‖
3 הכל סר מֵאַחֲרָו | יחדו נאלחו ‖
אין עשה טוב | אין גם אחד ‖
4 הלא יָדוּעַ יָדָעוּנִי | פעלי און ‖
אכלי עמי אָכוּל לחם | אֹתִי לא יָרָאוּ ‖

5 שם פחדו פחד | לא היה פחד ‖
כי יַהֲוֶה אלהֶיךָ בָחַר | בדור צדיק ‖
6 יַהֲוֶה פזר עצמות חנך | הבִישׁוּ כי [-] מאסם ‖

---

7 מי יתן מציון ישועת ישראל
בשוב יהוה שבות עמו
יגל יעקב ישמח ישראל

---

1. Es sprach ein Tor in seinem Sinn:
   „Es gibt keinen Gott;
   „Verderbt, abscheulich handeln sie —
   niemand beachtets.“ —

2. Jahwe, vom Himmel lugt' er aus
   auf die Menschenkinder,
   Zu sehn, ob's 'nen Verständigen gäbe,
   der da fragte nach Gott.
3. Alles war von ihm gewichen,
   insgesamt entartet;
   Da war keiner, der Gutes tat,
   auch nicht ein Einzger:
4. „Lernten mich nicht gründlich kennen
   die Übeltäter,
   „Die da fraßen mein Volk, als äßen sie Brot,
   ohne mich zu fürchten?!“ —

5. Da erschrak man gewaltig,
   und war doch kein Schrecken;
   Denn Jahwe dein Gott nahm sich an
   des gerechten Geschlechts:
6. Jahwe verstreute deines Belagerers Gebeine —
   sie scheiterten, weil er sie verworfen!

---

7. O daß von Zion käme das Heil Israels!
   Wenn Jahwe wendet seines Volks Geschick,
   Wird Jakob jubeln, Israel sich freuen.

THREE ASSYRIOLOGICAL FOOTNOTES TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER
BOSTON UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

THE purpose of these notes is to bring to the attention of Old Testament students some unnoticed passages of R. F. Harper's *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters* (14 volumes, 1892-1914) that have a bearing on the history and religion of the Israelites.

1. *Ilāni* = *Elohim*

The plural of *ilu* (god) used, like *elohim* in the O. T., in the sense of "deity" is well known in the Tell-el-Amarna correspondence (cf. Hehn, *Die Biblische und die Babylonische Gottesidee*, Leipzig 1913, pp. 171 ff.), but the occurrences of this idiom in the time of Ashurbanipal have been generally overlooked. Hehn (*loc. cit.*) notes but a single instance in Harper's *Letters*. Several passages listed below have been collected by Behrens (*Assyrisch-babylonische Briefe kultischen Inhalts*, Leipzig 1906, p. 6, note 2).

a) "Ashur my deity" (*ilāni-ia*): Harper 287 rev. 8; 290 obv. 12; 292 obv. 6; 297 obv. 6; 1170 obv. 10 f.

b) *Ilāni* used with the verb in the singular: "As to the man who serves according to the command of his lords (*bēlē-šu*, his master?), the *shedu* deity (*ilāni*), his [. . .], will lead him (*iraddi-šu*) on an auspicious path" (118 obv. 9 ff.). "On the second day the deity (*ilāni*) of the king will protect (us) (*inaṣur*)" (433 obv. 6 ff.). "Your deity (*ilāni-ka*), if anyone has had something to do with the matter, has (indeed) given express orders (*šutu-ma pî-šu ittidin*)" (392 rev. 9 ff.).

c) Adjectival use of *ilāni* in the genitive (for the parallel construction of *elohim* see Arnold, *Ephod and Ark*, pp. 29 ff., 35 f.): "The sacred stable" (*urū ša ilāni*) (65 obv. 20); "the sacred charioteer" (*mukīl-asāte ša ilāni*) (65 obv. 21-rev. 1); "the divine ordinances" (*parṣē ša ilāni*) (65 rev. 10); "your temple" (*bīt ilāni-ka*) (532 rev. 10); "the temple" (*bīt ilāni*) (566 rev. 6).

2. Judah's tribute to Assyria

Harper, *Letters*, No. 632, is a report of the payment of tribute on the part of Judah and of neighboring nations to the Assyrian king. It reads: "Two mana of gold the Ammonites, one mana of gold the Moabites, ten mana of silver the Judeans, [. . .] mana of silver the [Edomites (?)], [. . .] the Gublites (i. e. the people of Gebal or Byblus), unto (?) the king my lord have sent." (Obv. [1] *II ma-na ḫuraṣi* [2] *matubit am-man-na-a-a* [3] *I ma-na ḫuraṣi* [4] *matumu-'-ba-a-a* [5] *X ma-na kaspi* [6] *matuya-u-da-a-a* [7] *[. . . ma-n]a kaspi* [8] *. . . -a-a* [9] *. . . (Rev.)* [1] *. . .* [2] *[matu gu]-ub-la-a-a* [3] *[ana ir]ti (?) ša šarri beli-ia* [3] *us-si-bi-lu-u-ni*).

The nations seem to be ordered according to the amount paid, beginning with the largest. The sums are surprisingly small and must represent payments of annual tribute rather than war indemnities. The fact that Judah pays less than the Moabites and less than half of the amount sent by the Ammonites, sanctions the inference that this report should be dated after 701 B. C., when Sennacherib had materially reduced, impoverished, and depopulated the kingdom of Hezekiah. It is safe to assume that the payment was made either to Esarhaddon (681-668) or to Ashurbanipal (668-625) by Manasseh (691-638), who is named by both these Assyrian rulers in a list of 12 faithful vassals of Southern Syria and Phoenicia, together with the kings of the nations mentioned in this report (*Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* II, pp. 149 and 239).

This unique record is important both for Assyrian and for Palestinian history. Lists giving the exact amount of annual tribute paid to Assyria are very scarce. In his *History of Assyria* (1923), Olmstead mentions but three (pp. 129, 383, 607),

covering other territories, overlooking, however, the text under discussion. The Old Testament gives occasionally the exact amount of war indemnities (2 Ki. 15 19; 18 14; 23 33) but, with the exception of the tribute in kind paid by Mesha of Moab to Omri (2 Ki. 3 4; LXX[B], however, regards it as an indemnity), never specifies the sums paid annually by a king to his foreign overlord.

3. The earliest reference to the kiblah

It was probably in Babylonia soon after 586 B. C. that the Jews began to turn their faces toward Jerusalem, or more exactly toward the spot where the Holy of Holies had stood, in their prayers. Ezekiel (8 16) condemns in the strongest terms the practice of worshiping the sun with the back toward the temple and the face toward the East. The post-exilic prayer of Solomon (1 Ki. 8 44, 48) and later passages in the Old Testament (Ps. 5 8 [Eng. 5 7]; 28 2; Dan. 6 11 [Eng. 6 10]) and in the Apocrypha (Tobit 3 11; 3 Ezra 4 58) assume that Jews in foreign countries turned their faces in the direction of Jerusalem in their worship of Jehovah. This custom is alluded to in the Mishnah (*Berakoth* 4 5). Jerome, commenting on Ez. 8 16, writes, "*Praecipiente ipso Domino per Moysen, quoad nequaquam in morem Gentilium contra Orientem Deum orare deberent, sed in quacumque fuissent orbis parte . . . adorarent contra templum.*"

This Jewish custom, which was adopted by Mohammed (Koran 2 136-145) and became a characteristic feature of Islamic worship, has not been noticed, to my knowledge, in the ancient religions before the exile. It is, therefore, interesting to note a clear allusion to the *kiblah* in a letter written from Erech before 625 B. C., presumably to Ashurbanipal (Harper, *Letters*, No. 1387). The purpose of this communication, so far as it can be made out from the mutilated condition of the tablet, which as yet has not been published in translation, seems to be to assure the Assyrian king of the devotion of leading citizens of Erech. The unknown writer prays Ishtar and Nana for the preservation of the life of the king of countries, his lord, for the stability of his royal throne, for

the overthrow of his enemy, for his peace, and for the skill and productivity of his craftsmen. He assures the king that Bel and the Lady of Erech, Nabu and Nana, by graciously turning their countenances toward Assyria, will grant blessings. A number of men and the nobility of Erech assure the writer that they are with him and add, after a passage that is not clear, "As formerly we turn our faces to Assyria in our prayers to the gods [or: deity] of the king." (Rev. [8] *ki-i* [9] *ša maḫ-ri-im-me pa-ni-ni* [10] *a-na* ^{matu}*aššur*^{ki} *ni-iš-kun* [11] *ina ṣu-li-e ša ilāni ša šarri*). The allusion to the *kiblah* is unmistakable: the turning of the face toward Assyria in praying to Assyrian gods is evidently a well established usage dating from earlier days. Not the least surprising peculiarity of this statement is the assumption that the prayers offered in Erech by people turning their faces toward Assyria could be heard by the gods of that country in the distant North. Such a spiritual conception of the deity is truly astonishing at this time outside of the Old Testament. Even though the Jewish exiles in Babylonia would presumably have turned their faces toward Jerusalem, when they offered prayer, independently of external influences, we may well suppose that the existence of this Babylonian usage contributed to give a permanent character to the institution of the *kiblah* among the Jews.

BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

The Strophic Arrangement of the Benedicite

AN examination of the text of the so-called "Septuagint" and Theodotionic versions of the "Benedicite" reveals a number of important differences. In the first place, they vary in the number of verses, LXX having two more than Theod. They are also different in the arrangement of verses. One is led naturally to wonder why there should be such differences in what appears to have been, originally, a single Hebrew hymn.

After the model of other Hebrew hymns, we should expect to find in the Benedicite a definite stanza measurement. So far, in the many studies made of the hymn, no one seems to have mentioned the detection of specific stanza divisions. Now a principle of the stanza is that it divides with the moments of thought, each stanza representing a new moment of thought. It is possible, then, that definite stanzas can be marked off, if the hymn is examined with an effort to note such differences of the thought content.

A very definite step in the progress of the thought of the poem is evident with verse 74.[1] The step is indicated by a change in construction (from the second person to the third). The address to the earth is the beginning of a new moment of thought. This division, occurring actually in the middle of the hymn, is significant.

With the hymn divided thus into halves, other divisions may well be sought for. A natural break in the movement of the

[1] Verse numbers used in this article are those of H. B. Swete's *The Old Testament in Greek*, Vol. III.

thought occurs at verse 64. In the preceding verses, the poet has been dealing with things on high (in the heavens); now his mind turns to phenomena which he conceives as coming from the heavens. The division at this point leaves the first section of the poem in both recensions to consist of seven verses.

Bearing in mind the Hebrew fondness for the number seven,[2] we might expect to find the second section of the first half of the hymn to contain seven verses. As a matter of fact, LXX has 10 and Theod. 8 verses. It is singular, also, that the greatest differences between the two in the content and arrangement of verses occur in this section. It is well to clear up these difficulties, if possible, before proceding further, to try whether this division of the author's thought can be reduced to seven verses also.

Thus far in the poem, the writer seems to have expressed in each verse a fairly distinct and separate idea. On the probable theory that he would not repeat ideas already included in other verses, verses 67 and 68 might be eliminated, with the feeling that they are sufficiently included in verse 70 which is the same in both recensions. In the same way, verse 69 could be stricken out since it is partly taken up by verse 70 and has only a half equivalent in Theod. where verse 69 is a partial repetition of verse 66. In other words, by striking out verses 67 and 68 from LXX (which are not in Theod.) and verse 69 from both LXX and Theod., we have left a section of seven verses in both cases.

Viewing this first half, then, as originally complete with fourteen verses, with each verse expressing a distinct idea, we begin to sense the trend of the poet's thought. There is a gradual

[2] An interesting as well as recent discussion of this subject is the article "Some uses of Numbers" by Dr. John P. Peters published in this Journal, 38, pp. 15ff. In treating of the number "seven" as having a certain mystical meaning, Dr. Peters mentions the Beatitudes and the petitions of the Lord's Prayer as well-known examples. He points, in greater detail, to a seven-fold division of the first eleven chapters of Genesis each marked off (except the first) with the words, "These are the generations," also, to the seven occurrences of, "And God saw that it was good" (Gen. 1 4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31), and the seven repetitions of the phrase "All is vanity and striving after Wind" in Ecclesiastes 1 14; 2 11; 2 17; 2 26; 4 4; 4 16; 6 9.

descent from the heavens down to the earth. Now that this thought is complete, he concerns himself with the part of God's creation which he sees upon the earth.

After verse 74, the next step in the development of the author's thought occurs with verse 82. This first part of the second half of the hymn contains eight verses and is almost identical in both LXX and Theod. The one out-standing difference between the two is in the content and order of verse 77. In LXX "showers and fountains" has only a half equivalent ("fountains") in Theod., where the verse is found to follow verse 78. This difference may have resulted from the feeling that the idea "fountains" (or "springs," which is nearer the meaning of πηγαί) was not sufficiently different from the "rivers" of verse 78 to stand alone in this verse. In any case, to strike out verse 77 would restore the same verse arrangement in both recensions and leave the sequence of ideas to stand in what seems to be the correct order.

In the third part of the poem just now considered, the writer has dealt with God's creation on earth in a fashion not unlike that of the author of the first chapter of Genesis. He does not speak of God's human creation until verse 82. Here, apparently, the fourth section of the poem begins. Even thru these last verses there is evident a movement down to the spiritually minded in the community . . . "holy and humble in heart."

In this last quarter of the hymn there are nine numbered verses (actually ten). The last three so-called "narrative" verses (88–90) are somewhat out of tune with the form and thought of the writer in the preceding verses. One authority (Dr. R. H. Charles) has suggested that these verses are a later enlargement of what was the original conclusion. It is very probable, however, that the original, or something like it, is to be found in these three verses. In this case, verse 90 with its rather inclusive "all ye that worship" would seem to be most fitting as a conclusion. Verse 90 in Theod. is to be preferred over that in LXX which contains a needless addition of "and to the ages of the ages." Here too, then, there were probably seven verses.

With the same motive that leads us to conceive of the original

Benedicite as a four-stanza poem of 28 verses (seven in each stanza), we might examine the Benedictus Es which is placed immediately before it in the Greek Daniel. In this poem there are five numbered verses (actually six) and each verse contains a single idea with the exception of verse 55 (LXX), which has two distinct and separate thoughts. It is reasonable to believe that the latter phrase, "sittest upon the cherubim," was once by itself as a single verse. This would make seven verses in all and bring the poem more into harmony with the form that Hebrew poets have used so often.

The following arrangement presents the results of the above discussion.

BENEDICITE

(LXX)

57 1 Bless the Lord, all ye works of the Lord,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

59 2 Bless the Lord, ye heavens,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

58 3 Bless the Lord, ye angels of the Lord,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

60 4 Bless the Lord, all ye waters above the heaven,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

61 5 Bless the Lord, all ye powers of the Lord,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

62 6 Bless the Lord, sun and moon,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

63 7 Bless the Lord, ye stars of heaven,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

---

64 8 Bless the Lord, every shower and dew,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

65 9 Bless the Lord, all ye winds,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

66 10 Bless the Lord, ye fire and heat,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

(LXX)

70 11 Bless the Lord, ye hoarfrosts and snows,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

71 12 Bless the Lord, ye nights and days,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

72 13 Bless the Lord, light and darkness,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

73 14 Bless the Lord, ye lightnings and clouds,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

---

74 15 Let the earth bless the Lord,
Let (it) praise and highly exalt him forever.

75 16 Bless the Lord, ye mountains and hills,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

76 17 Bless the Lord, all ye things growing upon the earth,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

78 18 Bless the Lord, ye seas and rivers,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

79 19 Bless the Lord, ye whales and all things that move in the waters,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

80 20 Bless the Lord, all ye birds of the heaven,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

81 21 Bless the Lord, all ye wild beasts and cattle,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

---

82 22 Bless the Lord, ye sons of men,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

83 23 Bless the Lord, Israel,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

84 24 Bless the Lord, ye priests,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

85 25 Bless the Lord, ye servants,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

86 26 Bless the Lord, ye spirits and souls of the righteous,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

(LXX)

87 27 Bless the Lord, ye holy and humble (men) in heart,
Praise and highly exalt him forever.

90 28 Bless the God of Gods, all ye that worship,
Praise and acknowledge (him),
For his mercy (is) forever.

BENEDICTUS ES

52 1 Blessed art thou, O Lord God of our Fathers,
And praised and highly exalted forever.

2 And blessed is the holy name of thy glory,
And highly praised and highly exalted forever.

53 3 Blessed art thou in the temple of thy holy glory,
And highly praised and highly glorified forever.

54 4 Blessed art thou on the glorious throne of thy kingdom,
And praised and highly exalted forever.

55b (5) Blessed art thou that sittest (upon) the cherubim,
And praised and highly exalted forever.

55a 6 Blessed art thou that beholdest the depths,
And praised and glorified forever.

56 7 Blessed art thou in the firmament of heaven,
And praised and glorified forever.

Okanogan, Wash. ELMER B. CHRISTIE

An Identification of tiškaḥ yĕmīnī, Ps. 137 5

The common rendering of this phrase is still, "Let my right hand forget *her cunning*" — as if having to deal with the usual verb שכח "to forget." The words *her cunning*, however, are not to be found in the Hebrew text. They merely represent an indispensable addition made by translators in order to supply the direct object required by תִּשְׁכַּח in consequence of its interpretation as a transitive verb, "to forget." The actual absence of this object in the MT then naturally induced modern scholars to suggest a change of vocalization, viz. תִּשָּׁכַח, so as

to give the same verb a *passive* form in supposed accordance[1] with LXX ἐπιλησθείη. Now "Let my right hand *be forgotten*" presents a very poor sense and bad parallelism with תדבק לשוני לחִכי, although apparently more satisfactory grammatically. But precisely in view of this latter fact one could hardly imagine how, in dealing with so familiar a verb as שכח, "to forget," it would have occurred even to the least scholarly copyist or Masorete to mistakenly change the vocalization from a supposed תִּשְׁכַּח to the apparently less correct MT תִּשְׁכַּח. Thus the authenticity of the latter vocalization seems well to be warranted by the very fact of its having been preserved by the Masorah notwithstanding the grammatical disadvantage entailing a forced interpretation of תִּשְׁכַּח as "forget *her cunning*." If there is anything wrong here, it must then be with the consonants.

Ehrlich's[2] suggestion to read תִּשְׁכָּחִינִי instead of תִּשְׁכַּח יְמִינִי is a little too easy, paying no heed at all to parallelism. There is, however, all evidence from the context that our phrase is parallel to תדבק לשוני לחכי. While the latter clause speaks of a physical disablement of the tongue that would henceforth be prevented from singing, תשכח ימיני must similarly convey the idea of crippling the right hand to make it incapable of playing the musical instruments mentioned in verse 2.

The reading תִּכְחַשׁ, however, adopted by many a scholar since Graetz's days, can hardly suit our context where "to grow lean" (כחש) would present an obviously too pale and prosaic[3] parallel to תדבק . . . לחִכי, "*cleave to the* mouth-roof." This latter expression seems best to point to a counterpart similarly connoting *loss* of the faculty *of motion*.

Now to the same effect we find a very curious and suggestive

[1] This accordance seems to be only superficial, i. e., of a morphological character. Semantically speaking, however, the optative *aorist* ἐπιλησθείη might perhaps have the same active connotation that attaches to the MT תִּשְׁכַּח, being derived from a *deponent* verb ἐπιλανθάνομαι, "to forget." The rule of the object in the *genitive* characterizing this verb makes it further improbable to give the above passive form also a passive meaning.

[2] See A. B. Ehrlich, *Die Psalmen*, Berlin 1905, pp. 356–7.

[3] The same can be said of Perles' suggestion to view תִּשְׁכַּח as a combination of the Mishnaic phrase . . . תֵּשׁ כֹּחַ, lit. "the power of . . . grew weak." It is rather ingenious, but can hardly have here any practical value.

remark in Ibn-Ezra's commentary (XIIth cent.). After having accepted the usual interpretation of our verse, albeit "the object of תשכח ימיני is missing," he adds with regard to this verb the following short observation: "However, some say it means תיבש, being a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον.*" This תִּיבַשׁ "to dry up" evidently refers to 1 Ki. 13 4 ותיבש ידו . . . ולא יכל להשיבה אליו, where it properly means "to be *paralysed.*" Cf. also Zech. 11 17. Thus in the XIIth century there were scholars who considered our תשכח as an *intransitive* verb—different from the common שכח "to forget"—with the proper signification "to be paralysed." Very probably we are here in the presence of one of those curious cases where tradition might have sporadically preserved the correct *connotation* of a phrase even after the original form of the latter had been impaired in writing.

Be that as it may, the MT תִּשְׁכַּח certainly represents a mere metathesis of תִּכְשַׁח from an archaic verb כָּשַׁח, "to be paralysed, lame." This is sufficiently borne out by Arabic where the same root has been preserved under various forms, as كَسِحَ "to be *crippled* in the legs," أَكْسَحُ "lame, cripple," كَسِيحٌ "weak-*handed*, impotent," كَسْحٌ, "lameness, impotence of the *limbs*," كُسَاحَةٌ "crippleness." Our אם אשכחך ירושלים תִּכְשַׁח ימיני, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, Let my right hand grow *paralysed* (or *crippled*)" originally presented a mere case of *assonance*, a form of style of which Hebrew poetry is quite fond, and which in medieval Arabic, for instance, became almost a mania.[4] Now, when the identity of this תכשח as a *hapax legomenon* had been forgotten, any copyist could not but confuse its root with that of אשכחך, precisely on account of the original assonance with it. Thus most naturally arose the MT תשכח instead of the archaic and genuine תִּכְשַׁח, cf. above Arab. كَسِحَ etc.

Pittsburgh, Pa. ISRAEL EITAN

[4] Compare, e. g., any paragraph or maxim in Zamakhshari's *Golden Necklaces* (اطواق الذهب), ed. Barbier de Meynard, Paris 1876.

Two Notes on the Kalamu Inscription

1. In the Hebrew inscription of King Kalamu, *c.* 850 B. C., found at Zenjirli in the far north of Syria, published by von Luschan in *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*, iv (1911), and first interpreted by Littmann (*SB* of the Berlin Academy, 1911, 976 ff.), occurs a phrase the sense of which is clear, although it is somewhat variously interpreted. The royal inscriber relates how he effected peace between the two castes of his subjects, the MuŠKaBîM, apparently the "depressed" element, and the Ba'RîRîM, or "barbarians," apparently the ruling class of invaders. Of the former he says: "I took hold of the Muškabim by the hand, and המת שת נבש כם יתם באם." This Littmann translates, understanding נבש as נפש: "sie haben (mir) gegeben Vertrauen wie das Vertrauen einer Waise bei der Mutter." Lidzbarski, *Eph.* 3, 218 ff. (1912), renders: "so daß sie (mir) eine Gesinnung zeigten, wie die Gesinnung der Waise zu ihrer Mutter." Torrey, *JAOS* 35 (1917), 365 ff., pursues a different grammatical construction, regarding שת as first person (שַׁתִּי): "I gave them affection (for me) like the affection of the fatherless for his mother." But the interpreters of the passage have not recognized a Biblical parallelism, namely in Ps. 131 3:

אם לא שויתי ודוממתי נפשי כגמל עלי אמו

"I have *composed* and silenced my soul like a weanling by his mother." The verb שית in Kalamu is entirely identical in meaning, I take it, with שוה, in the Ps., = "set, settle, compose." Torrey speaks of Kalamu's "whimsically humorous, almost jocose" vein; and we may also remark the note of pathos, which recurs again in one of the tenderest passages of the Bible. The pathetic appears also in the Phoenician inscriptions, e. g. that of Eshmunazar, where the king speaks of himself as "cut off untimely," and laments himself, according to the favorite interpretation of an obscure passage, as "an orphan, son of a widow."

2. In the same text there occurs twice a perplexing vocable: l. 5, הלפניהם, and l. 10, הלפנים. In the first case, after reciting that four named predecessors accomplished nothing (בל פעל), the king boasts that "what I have done בל פעל

הלפניהם." Littmann and Lidzbarski translate identically, "did not do the predecessors." They agree in eliminating the second ה, emending from the case in l. 10, while Lidzbarski offers the dubious suggestion that it may be a phenomenon like the South Arabic vowel-letter ה. Both assume a unique *nisbe*-form from the preposition לפני. The only comparable case might be פנימי < פנימה < פנים. Torrey interprets more sensibly: "that which I accomplished no one (even) of their predecessors had done," i. e. the predecessors of the kings just named. He appears tacitly to agree with the earlier interpreters in regard to the alleged *nisbe*-formation, but then he allows a noun with the article and in construction with a suffix. (For such possible cases see Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 127, i, where probably all the cases are corrupt, with the exception of the articulated ppl. governing the acc., as in Arabic.)

But grammatical simplification can be had by regarding the article as a relative particle, "*who* were before them." This use of the article appears in Biblical Hebrew; but only with the perfect of verbs, (*ib.* § 138, i. k). But this use of the article with a nominal predicate appears in Arabic; see Wright, *Arab. Gr.*, I, § 343, Rem. c. And I must think that some such sense of the article underlies the well known Arabic syntax of the "qualificative" phrase (*ib.* 2, pp. 283 f.); e. g. *ra'aitu Zaidan al-ḥasana wajhuhu,* "I saw Z. the one (who) handsome is his face" (in all such cases with the weakening of the relative sense of the article, so that the adjective is attracted in case, but not in gender, to the antecedent). That is, the demonstrative element *h* played, to a limited extent, the same part as the similar demonstratives, *z* in Hebrew, *d* in Aramaic, *š* in Akkadian and Old Hebrew.

I confess I do not know what to make exactly of the second occurrence of the vocable: "I sat upon the throne of my father לפן המלכם הלפנים," translated generally, "in presence of the preceding kings." Does this mean that he took position before the Manes of his predecessors? "Those who were before" should be spelt *defective*, הלפנם. We expect "who were before me." Is there an error induced by the earlier case?

University of Pennsylvania JAMES A. MONTGOMERY

Die Fortsetzung von Baudissins Kyrios-Werk

An der Herausgabe des umfassenden Werkes wird mit Hochdruck gearbeitet. Sicher zur Überraschung vieler Abnehmer erschienen, ehe der Erste Teil abgeschlossen war, als „Vierte Lieferung“ 10 Bogen des Dritten Teils, und die „Fünfte Lieferung“ brachte dann, außer den letzten 8 Bogen des Ersten, die ersten 2 Bogen des Zweiten Teils. Nun laufen der zweite und dritte Teil nebeneinander her, und es ist angesichts der unermüdlichen Arbeit des Herausgebers Otto Eissfeldt sichere Aussicht gegeben, daß das ganze Werk noch im Laufe dieses Jahres fertig vor uns liegen wird. Vorzüglich ist nach wie vor die Drucklegung; kein Wunder, da man hie und da Spuren findet, nach denen neben Eissfeldt selbst Littmann an den Korrekturen sich beteiligt, und dasselbe gilt für gewisse Abschnitte von H. Zimmern.

Man wird sich freuen, bald das Gesamtwerk überschauen zu können; denn das Buch bildet, so stückweise erscheinend, keineswegs eine bequeme laufende Lektüre. Es ist schwer, den Faden immer fest in der Hand zu behalten. Das liegt vor allem an der Masse des aufgehäuften, in die kleinsten Einheiten zerfallenden Stoffes, aber doch zum Teil auch an der Eigenart des Baudissinschen Schaffens. Nicht nur seine große, bewundernswürdige Gewissenhaftigkeit ist es, die ihm scharfe, klare Entscheidungen auf Schritt und Tritt erschwert, so daß er sie so lange wie irgend möglich hinausschiebt oder beim *non liquet* stehn bleibt; sondern auch eine angeborene Scheu vor positiver Kritik, die ja ohne Konjektur und Kombination nicht auskommt, daher immer eine starke Beimischung von Subjektivem mit sich führt. Vermöge dieser Scheu entwickelt sich bei Baudissin eine Art von grundehrlichem Probabilismus, der gern zwischen verschiedenen Möglichkeiten die Wahl läßt.

Bei einem besonderen Abschnitt habe ich aber auch den Eindruck erhalten, daß an solchem Schwanken des Urteils der Wunsch, seine Grundthese gefördert zu sehen, einen erheblichen Anteil hat. Das ist im III. Teil, I. Abt., III. Kap., „Die Gottesnamen mit der Bedeutung ‚Herr‘“, der Abschnitt I. „*baʿal, bēl*“ (S. 20 ff., besonders 27–44). „Fraglich kann erscheinen,“

lesen wir S. 27, „welche Bedeutung die Benennung *baʿal* bei West- und Südsemiten hatte — für das babylonische *bēl* ist es kaum der Fall — nämlich ob, wie wir vorausgesetzt haben, die von „Herr“ oder vielmehr die von „Besitzer“, wonach sie in die Reihe der hier zu besprechenden Gottesbenennungen nicht gehören würde.“ Sehe ich recht, so durfte hier nichts vorausgesetzt, sondern es mußte mit der nüchternen und erschöpfenden sprachlichen Untersuchung des Begriffes *baʿal* in seinem rein appellativen und profanen Gebrauch eingesetzt werden. Die aber ist S. 27ff. nur hie und da, punkt- und strichweise angerührt, mit gelegentlichen Zugeständnissen nach der andren Seite, z. B. S. 28 für *baʿal* „Ehemann“ als „Besitzer des Weibes“. Völlig durchgeführt hätte diese Untersuchung sicherlich W. Robertson Smith, B. Stade, Eduard Meyer (vgl. S. 29f.) Recht geben müssen, daß *baʿal* nicht den „Herren“, sondern den „Besitzer“, auch des Kultusortes, bezeichne. Baudissin widerlegt sich meines Erachtens selber, wenn er (S. 29) zum Beweise für seine Anschauung deutsche Vorkommen anführt, wo „in dem Ortsnamen dem Heiligennamen eine nähere Bestimmung nach dem Orte hinzugefügt wird, wie Maria-Einsiedeln, Mariazell“, die aber „diesen Heiligen nicht als den Besitzer des Ortes, sondern, im Unterschied von anderen, als den dort verehrten bezeichne“. Die Namen beweisen ja das Gegenteil: „wo Maria siedelt“, „Zelle der Maria“. Sie besitzt den Ort im eigentlichsten Sinne, er ist von ihr besessen, sie ist das den Ort beseelende *numen loci:* darum, weil man sie als dessen Besitzerin kennt, verehrt man sie dort, und nicht anderswo. Es ist genau dasselbe, was Jakob von dem *ēl* von Bethel (Gen. 28 16ff.) erfahren hat und glaubt, und dasselbe gilt von den mit *baʿal* zusammengesetzten Ortsnamen. Alles in allem glaube ich nicht, daß man mit Baudissin (S. 32) sagen darf, daß die Verbindung von *baʿal* mit einem Ortsnamen im Westsemitischen sich ebenso gut „wie von dem Besitzer verstehen lasse von dem „Herrn“, der an dem betreffenden Orte verehrt wird.“ Wo aber der Genetiv fehlt (vgl. S. 35), da hat *baʿal* eben die ursprüngliche Wortbedeutung schon verloren und den Begriff „Gott“ angenommen, der nun weder mehr als „Besitzer“ noch als „Herr“ gedeutet werden darf. Ich muß es bei diesen

Andeutungen bewenden lassen: der Wunsch, auch bei *ba'al* auf den „Herrn" hinauszukommen, scheint mir hier wesentlich zu der schwankenden Haltung Baudissins beigetragen zu haben. Und doch hätte er wohl auch den „Besitzer" in etwas weiterem Sinne unter den „Herrn" einreihen dürfen.

Natürlich können kleine Schönheitsfehler den hohen Wert des grundlegenden Werkes nicht beeinträchtigen. Wir freuen uns seines rüstigen Fortschreitens und sehen mit großer Genugtuung seiner baldigen Vollendung entgegen.

Universität Marburg K. Budde

Inzwischen sind bis Anfang Mai auch noch die Sechste Lieferung (Dritter Teil, Bogen 11–20) und die Siebente Lieferung (Zweiter Teil, Bogen 3–12) erschienen, und der Abschluß des Werkes wird bis Ende des laufenden Jahres in Aussicht gestellt.

Summer Meetings

Members of the Society who plan to be abroad this summer are heartily invited to attend either or both of the following meetings:

(1) *Der Fünfte Deutsche Orientalistentag,* which will be held at Bonn August 21 to 25. This will consist of sessions devoted to the field of Old Testament and Oriental studies, together with a celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Deutsche Palästina-Verein.

(2) *The Seventeenth International Congress of Orientalists,* to be held at Oxford August 27 to September 1.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Epistolae et logistorici. No. 1, *Romulus et Jesus-Christ.* No. 2–5, *Von Adam bis zu Jesu Christo.* No. 6–7, *Über das zehnmonatliche Jahr und die chronologische Methode.* By Vasili Sinaïsky. Published by the author at Latvija—Riga, 1926/27. Pp. 16 + 72 + 28. $ —.25, $ —.75, $ —.25.

Les XII Tables au Point de Vue de la Chronologie de Rome et de son Calendrier. By Vasili Sinaïsky. Riga: Typographie de L'Etat, 1926. Pp. 145. $ 1.50.

Toward the Light. By Mary Fels. New York: George Dobsevage, 1927. Pp. 281. $ 2.50.

The Altars of the Old Testament. By Harold M. Wiener. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1927. Pp. 34. M. 5.—.

Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina. Band I: Jahreslauf und Tageslauf. 1. Hälfte: Herbst und Winter. Mit 37 Abbildungen. (Schriften des Deutschen Palästina-Instituts, 3. Band, 1. Hälfte.) By Gustaf Dalman. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1928. Pp. XIV + 279.

Research in the Humanistic and Social Sciences. By F. A. Ogg. New York: The Century Co., 1928. Pp. VIII + 454.

Für Gott und das Volk: Gebete der sozialen Erweckung. By Walter Rauschenbusch. Translated and revised by Minna Griebel and Heinrich Frick. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928.

Das Neue Testament (Elfte Auflage). Jubiläumsausgabe. Translated by Carl Weizsäcker. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927. Pp. XII + 458. M. 3.—.

The See of Peter. By James T. Shotwell and Louise Ropes Loomis. New York: Columbia University Press, 1927. Pp. 737. $ 10.—.

A truly scholarly volume in the series RECORDS OF CIVILIZATION, Sources and Studies. It gives the documentary basis for papal claims.

Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann in Giessen:

Welches war die älteste Religion Israels? By Georg Beer. 1927. Pp. 39. M. 1.50.

Der Kommentar des David Qimchi zum Propheten Nahum. (Rabbinische Übungstexte, I. Heft.) By Walter Windfuhr. 1927. M. 1.30.

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
1928
220
JBL
RE
Vol. XLVII
Part

JESUS AND THE LAW

A STUDY OF THE FIRST 'BOOK' OF MATTHEW (MT. 3–7)

BENJ. W. BACON
YALE UNIVERSITY

AN English scholar of deservedly wide and high reputation has this to say regarding our subject: "The question of Christ's relation to the Jewish Law is one of fundamental importance for the origin of Christianity, but at the same time of peculiar difficulty." Among the difficulties enumerated not the least is this: "When we consider how bitter was the strife which this question aroused in the primitive church the misgiving is certainly not unreasonable that this may have been reflected back into the life of the Founder, and sayings placed in His mouth endorsing one of the later, partisan views."

Intentional falsification is alleged by none. Unintentional misrepresentation, however, is only too easy after very few years of oral transmission, whether by translation, interpretation, or paraphrase and interpretative supplement. Comparative study of the Gospels proves, in fact, that wide differences on this point actually do exist in our Gospel records, and the fact that they exist is not merely a justification for critical comparison, but a providential summons to apply it in the effort to make the nearest possible approach to historical truth.

Mark will be generally conceded to exhibit the most radical point of view in its representation of Jesus' action and utterance in resistance to Jewish legalism. The Gospel of Matthew, on the other hand, in spite of its close dependence upon Mark, and its intense antipathy to the type of doctrine it describes as the "leaven of the scribes and Pharisees," exhibits the most con-

servative or Jewish-Christian point of view. In fact it would appear to be one of the main objects of Matthew[1] to counteract what he designates "lawlessness" (ἀνομία) by presenting the whole message of Jesus as a new and higher Torah with apocalyptic sanctions. This evangelist writes that he may "teach all men everywhere to obey all things whatsoever Jesus commanded" (Mt. 28 20), and he reenforces this new Torah of Christianity by a very exceptional emphasis on the rewards and penalties of the world to come.

We must begin with the Gospel of Matthew, comparing with it the Gospel of Mark which our first evangelist adapts and uses. Nor need we now say more to substantiate the generally accepted fact that Matthew presents the teaching in a more legalistic and Jewish-Christian way than Mark, or to prove his special fear and hatred of the current teaching of "lawlessness," beyond citing a few outstanding passages. Matthew's opinion of the "teachers of lawlessness" is expressed with great vigor and clarity in a special paragraph inserted in 7 13–23, immediately before the closing parable of the Sermon on the Mount[2]. His dread of their effect upon the Church is expressed in his parable of The Tares in the Wheat, with its added Interpretation depicting the fate of "those that cause stumbling and work lawlessness." The parable of the Tares is sometimes regarded as Matthew's *Sondergut*, sometimes as his revision of Mark's parable of The Patient Husbandman, its parallel in position (Mt. 13 24–30 = Mk. 4 26–29). Either way the testimony of this supplement is striking. It is borne out by a special addition in Mt. 24 10–12 to Mark's prediction of the great apostasy before the End, an addition which holds the teaching of "lawlessness" responsible for the chilling of the love of the many, and the "stumbling" of believers. The whole

[1] The common designation of our first evangelist is adopted, of course, without prejudice to questions of authorship.

[2] The original ending of the discourse in the parable of the Wise and Foolish Builders (Mt. 7 24–27; Lk. 6 47–49) in this instance dictated the insertion of Matthew's supplement just before it, instead of attachment at the end, as in the later discourses.

structure of the Gospel indicates the evangelist's motives and anxiety. Especially do its closing words set forth his remedy for the parlous conditions of his time. He would meet them with the "commandment" of Jesus, enforced by his authority as messianic Judge of the World.

The closing warnings of two out of the five great discourses of Jesus which constitute the distinctive feature of this Gospel have already been cited. Mt. 7 13—23 and 13 36—50 are perhaps sufficiently explicit in their depiction of the fate of those who teach and practice "lawlessness," and have no "good works" to plead in their behalf at the judgment-seat of the Son of Man in "the end of the world." Matthew's idea of the sanction of this commandment is made more unmistakable by the close of the fifth and last discourse, depicting this scene of judgment in Mt. 25 31—46. But this is not all. If the two remaining discourses terminate in pictures of future reward and punishment somewhat less lurid in style, rewards for those who show kindness to Christ's messengers in conclusion of The Mission of the Twelve (10 40—42), punishment for the unmerciful in the discourse on Government (18 23—25), the change of tone is a minor one scarcely affecting the general theme. Sanction and motive are still the same. Matthew, like his contemporary and ally, the writer of Jude, relies on the rewards and penalties of the world to come as motives for the "good works" to which he urges his generation. Every one of his 'five books' of the Torah of Jesus is supplemented at the close of the compilation with "Matthean" material directed to this end.

The providential survival of two earlier witnesses fortunately supplies us with the means for a critical estimate of Matthew's distinctive conception of Jesus' relation to the Law. Mark, so poorly supplied with the "commandments" sought for in the subapostolic, neo-legalistic age, was rewritten independently in two different quarters with similar objects. It was almost eclipsed when Luke's far more pretentious work appeared, and still more when Matthew was raised by some unexplained influence to the rank of a supposed apostolic compilation. Mark was saved only

by its reputed connection with Peter. Complete disappearance was the fate of that document known to critics as the Second Source, a catechetic narrative, which was drawn upon by both Luke and Matthew to supply the lack of teaching material in Mark. Unprotected by the aegis of any apostolic name this document disappeared. Only the coincident appearance of supplementary teaching material, commonly designated Q, in the mutually independent Gospels of Matthew and Luke, enables the modern critic to reconstruct it. However, this Q material, supplemented by such kindred material as may be considered derived from the same writing though present in only one extant Gospel (and even by some material used by all three), constitutes a real Second Source (S), applicable along with Mark to the problem before us.

If, then, we put the general question how far the great difference between Mark and Matthew in their representation of Jesus' attitude toward the Law may be due to "sayings placed in his mouth endorsing one of the later, partisan views" by our first evangelist, the answer given by every impartial critic must be that the amount of such addition to Mark and S is very small. Matthew undoubtedly uses a third source (for which Streeter has recently proposed the symbol M), drawing from it such material as the Prologue (chs. 1–2), the "Petrine supplements" in Book IV (14 28–33; 16 17–19; 17 24–27), and a few apocryphal touches in the Epilogue (chs. 26–28), such as Pilate's Wife's Dream, Judas' Suicide, Apparitions in Jerusalem at the Death of Jesus, and The Watch at the Sepulchre. *Prima facie* there would be no objection to supposing that some also of the unique *teaching* material of Matthew was drawn from this source rather than S. In reality it is not even certain that in "M" we are dealing with a document rather than mere oral tradition. If a document its affinities were not with the teaching material, but with the narrative of Mark, which it embellishes after the manner of the Jewish targums[3]. Matthew's *teaching Sondergut* shows no affinity

[3] Cf. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, p. 502f. If a designation were required we should prefer the symbol N, avoiding thus confusion with the names Matthew

with it. Our problem, accordingly, resolves itself into a comparison of Matthew with his two principal sources: Mark, which we know independently, and S, which we can compare only indirectly, through Luke. Only thus can a worth-while judgment be passed on the character and degree of participation by the first evangelist himself in shaping and supplementing his material. The question is one of degree and kind rather than of fact; for even modern writers, attempting under the impulse of strong religious interest and feeling to set forth the life and teaching of Jesus, use similar paraphrase, interpretation and supplement. R^{mt}, however, is not a wholly indeterminable factor of the first Gospel. The evangelist has not only a distinctive animus, but a distinctive phraseology of his own.

Mere rearrangement of the material, with such incidental editorial touches as are thus necessitated will accomplish much toward changing the impression produced; and Matthew, notoriously, has completely rearranged the Markan story of the Galilean ministry, almost eliminating the distinction between an earlier period of prophetic activity in continuation of the summons to repentance uttered by the Baptist, and substituting for it an immediate promulgation of the New Law of the Kingdom. This discourse of the Lawgiver, known as the Sermon on the Mount, is the first of the series of five, each prefaced by appropriate narrative, which make up the substance of Matthew's Gospel, and in it (as critics agree) our evangelist has used no less freedom in rearranging Q material than in rearranging the story of Mark. So eager, in fact, is Matthew to come to the new code of "righteousness" proclaimed from the mountain in Galilee, that in the introductory narrative (chs. 3–4) he takes barely six verses from Mark's story of the beginning of the ministry (Mt. 4 $_{18-22}$ = Mk. 1 $_{16-20}$) to cover the whole subject of the call of the disciples, proceeding at once to borrow, for the audience addressed in the

and Mark, and calling attention rather to the striking resemblances between this Matthean source and the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*, early in use among the Aramaic-speaking Christians of Aleppo.

Sermon, Mark's description of the assembled Syrian multitude (Mt. 4 23–25 = Mk. 3 7–12). The entire body of teaching on the New Law which follows in Mt. 5 1–7 27 is thus presented in one mass, and its effect decribed in terms borrowed from Mk. 1 21 f., declaring the wonderment of the people at Jesus' teaching "with authority," as if this were in fact Jesus' first public utterance! Thus rearrangement alone, without recourse to any addition not derived from sources other than those used by Mark and Luke, produces a picture of Jesus' opening ministry widely differing from what we should derive either from Mark's story of Jesus' first Sabbath at Capernaum and subsequent conflict with scribes and Pharisees, or Luke's account of the opening scene at Nazareth, followed by the call of the fishermen from their nets, and the early campaign in the synagogues of "Judea."[4]

In addition to the general structure of the first Gospel as a new Torah in five 'books' of the commandments of Jesus, this striking modification and rearrangement of Mark's "beginning of the gospel" confirms our judgment of the interest Matthew has most at heart. This evangelist seeks to create a different idea of Jesus as a Teacher of the Law from that which a reader acquainted only with Mark's Gospel would entertain. From the very outset Jesus comes forward as a second Moses, offering by divine authority a new and higher "commandment." True, the discourse itself sets the teaching of Jesus in contrast with that of other teachers of the Law, but in Matthew the difference arises not from any charge of laxity raised against Jesus by scribes and Pharisees, as in Mk. 2 1–3 6. Our evangelist postpones this scene of conflict. With him the relation is reversed. Jesus arraigns the scribes and Pharisees for laxity. The "righteousness" of his followers must exceed theirs, else they cannot enter the kingdom of heaven (5 20 ff.).

We shall better appreciate what this Jewish-Christian evangelist of the sub-apostolic age is trying to do for his generation through his revision of Mark and combination of it with the Teaching

[4] *Vera lectio.*

Source, if we try to realize how the Gospel of Mark would sound in the ears of a catechist of the Syrian church, of Jewish training, ca. 90 A.D. Such a writer would know that Jesus was really (as Paul himself allows) "a minister of the circumcision," "under the Law" and loyal to Moses and the prophets. He would know that Jesus was no iconoclast, but a teacher of the highest type of Jewish morality and religion. Such a writer, however strong in his support of Gentile missions, perhaps even supporting Paul's free gospel of grace without the burden of the Law for those not born to it, a "scribe fully instructed unto the kingdom of heaven," possessed of that great body of ethical teaching (Q) revealed to us by Luke's independent use of the same material, could hardly be satisfied with Mark. As we read his revised Gospel we can hardly escape the impression that an important factor in his determination to write was the desire so to restate the relation of Jesus to the Law as to do justice to the conception current in an environment conversant with the Second Source. Matthew's motive for writing must be similar to Luke's, at least in so far as both effect their purpose mainly by blending Mk. with S. What other factors enter in to differentiate the two revisions we may enquire later. First of all we must seek a clear definition of Mark's attitude toward the question of precept and law.

Mark has three main sections dealing with the question of Jesus and the Law, the first being the series of anecdotes in 2 1–3 6 which relate how Jesus in his preaching of repentance came into collision with the synagogue leaders. These objected to his proclamation of forgiveness, his association with publicans and sinners, his disregard of the set fasts, and his laxity and that of his followers regarding sabbath observance. As noted above, Matthew postpones these scenes of conflict.

1. Mark, in this group of anecdotes, does not attempt to define Jesus' teaching, but treats the issue as one of bald authority[5]. Because he is the Son of Man, and can prove by miracle the

[5] The true text of Mk. 2 26ff. does not include verse 27.

divine source of his mission, the scribes have no right to object. The Son of Man has authority, even while on earth, to forgive sins, disregard the prescribed ordinances, and even, on occasion, to set aside the sabbath. This defiant attitude of Jesus toward the Law leads the Pharisees to conspire with the Herodians against his life.

2. The second of Mark's sections on Jesus and the Law deals with the subject more on principle, relating Jesus' reply to certain scribes from Jerusalem who took exception to his disregard of the Mosaic distinctions of "clean" and "unclean" (7 1—23). The story is prefixed to an account of Jesus' going among Gentiles with his blessings of healing and help, and imputes to him a drastic abolition of the "middle wall of partition" which in Paul's time had proved the chief barrier. The extraordinary supplement in Mk. 6 53—8 26 to the story of the Galilean ministry, a supplement which Luke omits in favor of a much fuller and more reliable account of how the gospel was carried to the Gentiles, rests in 7 1—23 on a Markan development of Jesus' saying about inward and external "cleanness" (Mt. 23 25 f. = Lk. 11 39—41). The supplement has the same pragmatic value as the legendary account in Acts 10 1—11 18 of how Peter was taught the same lesson by special divine revelation, and involves the same distinction between things which to God are "clean" but which the ordinances of men make "common."

In this section we cannot wholly acquit Mark of anti-Jewish animus or of an unhistorical imputation to Jesus of the freedom later achieved by application of his principles. The tone of contempt for Jewish ritual in 7 3 f. quite out-Pauls Paul, and the two verses are naturally omitted by Matthew. Mark also strains the meaning of the *logion* into a repudiation of the whole Mosaic system of ritual "cleanness," a misstatement of Jesus' attitude as contrary to what even Paul concedes as the misstatement in Acts 10 1—11 18 of the actual position of Peter. Nevertheless the central *logion* of 7 15 is certainly authentic (cf. Mt. 23 25 = Lk. 11 39—41), and, what is most of all important to our enquiry, the citation of Is. 29 13 placed in Jesus' mouth in Mk. 7 6 f. is not

only authentic but touches the very heart of our problem. Its authenticity appears not merely from its affinity with the other teachings of Jesus, but from the fact that Paul also, when dealing with the same subject of "clean" and "unclean" meats, resorts to the same Isaian citation, in exactly the same peculiar reading (Col. 2 22). Its right to be called the key to our problem appears in the fact that it reveals the true attitude of Jesus, both on this occasion and in others similar. His attitude is that of the great prophets, particularly Isaiah.

The vital distinction made both in Mk. 7 6 and Mk. 9 10 between human ordinances and the unwritten law of the Creator has a certain affinity with the Stoic doctrine: "Follow Nature," and it is not impossible that this affinity was apparent to our Roman evangelist and his readers. But it would be absurd, in view of the far-reaching, deep connections of this distinction with other teachings such as the contrast between written ordinances and the living example of the heavenly Father in the Sermon on the Mount, to resort to Gentile philosophy for the source, when the prophets (and above all Isaiah) are constantly on Jesus' lips, and display a much closer affinity. If Jer. 31 31 deserves its designation "the gospel in the Old Testament," surely the great prophecy of "the consolation of Israel," whereof Is. 29 9—24 forms an organic element, both intrinsically and in the known resort to it of the early church in its conflict with the synagogue, has at least an equal right to be so called.

Is. 29 9—24 is a protest, appealed to more than once by both Jesus and Paul, by our canonical evangelists, and by the Nazarene Christians of Aleppo in the time of Apollinarios of Laodicea, against the vain pretensions of the champions of book religion, blind and deaf to the teaching of the living God of nature and providence. The date of the Isaian section cannot be determined with certainty, but it echoes the protest of Jeremiah against the futile attempts of his time to reform Israel by the enactment of codes and written covenants (Jer. 31 31 ff.). As such it offered to Jesus the best possible standing-ground in his resistance to "the leaven of the Pharisees," a legalistic tendency which he

cannot have failed to discern in the opposition so successfully brought by the scribes and Pharisees to his message of redemption, and which he would seem to have foreseen as a subtle menace to the right-thinking of his own disciples (Lk. 12 1; cf. Mk. 8 15 = Mt. 16 6). According to Mark this protest of Isaiah against "ordinances of men" was the very Palladium of Jesus in his conflict against the legalism of the scribes. It would seem to have been transmitted to Paul also in his struggle against converted (or should we not rather say half-converted) Judaizing Pharisees in the Church. As we have seen, the distinction of divine unwritten law and man-made ordinance was again invoked in the period of debate over the permissibility of Gentile missions. In spite of the explicit testimony of Gal. 2 1–21 to the contrary, Acts 10 1–11 18 even makes it a divine revelation to Peter, and this in days after Paul's victory had been won, notwithstanding Peter's vacillation. But in post-apostolic days no vision was considered too lofty or far-reaching for the chief apostle, while even Peter's name could not prevent the Church from returning to neo-legalism when threatened by the rising flood of antinomian laxity.

3. Mark's third group devoted to the question of Jesus and the Law is most explicit of all as regards the great issue of Law vs. Grace as the reliance of the Christian for "eternal life." It occupies Mk. 10 1–45 and groups together a series of anecdotes which we have elsewhere described as Mark's equivalent for the Sermon on the Mount.

The group begins with the story of an altercation between Jesus and the Pharisees in which Jesus once more, and with stronger emphasis, adduces the distinction between the unwritten law of the Creator, manifest in the primal instinct of monogamy, and the "ordinances of men" enacted to meet the hardness of unregenerate hearts.

Both Matthew and Luke make separate use of the *logion* on divorce (Mt. 5 18, 32 = Lk. 16 17f.), using it as an example of Jesus' attitude toward the Law, so that Mark does not stand alone in this application. The differences in treatment we must consider in due time. For the present only Mark's viewpoint is to be de-

termined. As already noted the emphasis of the story falls upon its closing word. Jesus ends the interview by contrasting divine and human law, placing the enactment of Moses in the latter class: "Faithfulness in marriage is the institution of God, divorce is an expedient of men." But the introductory dialogue also aims to show that Jesus does not disparage the expedient in its proper place. Moses' legislation is wise and humane, otherwise it would not be commended (v. 3). In very truth it does mark a great advance over the unlimited right of repudiation conferred on the husband by the primitive Semitic system of chattel marriage. The anecdote takes account of this in the implied commendation of Moses' requirement. But the direction Jesus himself has to give lifts us to a higher plane, that of the prophet, who voices not human but divine requirement: "Yahweh hateth putting away" (Mal. 2 14–16). Just as in Lk. 12 13 ff. Jesus refuses the function of the scribe, which hearers seek to thrust upon him, and demands the right to speak like a prophet in the name of Yahweh himself, for absolute values, so here. Moses is a lawgiver. He and his successors have their problem in the adjustment of the wrongs of man to man. Jesus refuses to be a lawgiver. He speaks as a prophet, one who in the name of the Creator demands faithfulness and mercy. The intrinsic sense of the story is obvious, it is less certain whether the evangelist who attaches the explanatory supplement Mk. 10 10–12 fully appreciated it.

Following immediately upon this anecdote illustrative of Jesus' attitude toward the religion of Law Mark gives another in 10 13–16 illustrative of the religion of Grace. All must come to the heavenly kingdom, if they come at all, in the spirit of little children, who receive what parental love supplies not as a wage, or reward of merit, but in simple trust and humility. Luke has a moral equivalent for this from his own independent source (L) in 17 7–10. In this *logion* also Jesus expresses his opposition to the legalistic conception of obedience and merit. There is almost a Pauline antipathy to the conception of "a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the Law" in the words: "When ye have done all say 'We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which

it was our duty to do'." But the *logion* stands isolated so far as Luke himself is concerned. Its testimony is all the more important in support of Mark because it comes from L rather than from the third evangelist.

In Mk. 10 17—31, which follows next, we have the central anecdote of the anti-legalistic section. Jesus is plainly asked by a typical Pharisee filled with the Pharisean idea of eternal life as a reward for obedience to commandments, one of those whom the Talmud describes as going from teacher to teacher asking some new precept to observe: "Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Jesus answers that obedience to the written precepts of the Law, commendable as it is ("he looked upon him and loved him"), gives no claim to this reward. To enter into life there is no other way than that which Jesus and his followers are now treading, renunciation of all earthly goods and setting the face toward Calvary. The point of difference between the "righteousness of scribes and Pharisees" and the Way of Jesus is made all the clearer by the refusal of the Pharisee to follow. The spirit which Paul describes as animating Christians whom he had himself known, leading them not only to "give all their goods to feed the poor" but even, like the Maccabean martyrs, to "give their bodies to be burned," was beyond the reach of this enquirer. The Pharisee turned away; for he had great possessions.

The affinity of this Markan anecdote illustrative of the difference between the religion of Law and the religion of Grace with the Q discourse on the Righteousness of Sons was so apparent to the primitive compiler of the *Gospel of the Naassenes* that he weaves together Mt. 5 45 and Mk. 10 18 in the *logion*: "Why callest thou me 'good'? One alone is 'good', my Father who is in heaven, who causes his sun to rise upon just and unjust, and sends rain upon saints and sinners." For some reason it appears difficult for moderns to see that in both utterances Jesus is indeed contrasting book religion with the ethic of sonship. His *halacha* ("walk") is to be an imitator of God and to 'walk' in love as beloved children; for Paul also, in Eph. 5 1, seems to have a similar idea of "the Law of Christ." 'Goodness' is simply to be kind

as God is kind. Religion is the pursuit of the divine ideal in a hope that knows no limit and a trust that knows no fear.

Just as in Mt. 6 19—34 our first evangelist follows up his presentation of the new Torah of Jesus by a long discourse on Treasure in Heaven paralleled by Lk. 12 22—36, interjecting only a section on Acceptable Acts of Righteousness (6 1—18), so Mark also proceeds, after the mention of "treasure in heaven" in the story of the Pharisean enquirer, to deal with this question of Heavenly Reward. The narrative proceeds with Peter's self-seeking demand on behalf of himself and the Twelve: "Lo, we have left all and followed thee," which Matthew does not hesitate to complete: "What then shall we have?" Jesus' reply is: For this world you have the hundred-fold compensation of a welcome into the brotherhood of the persecuted, and for the world to come eternal life (10 28—30). Consistently with his reply to the Pharisean Enquirer, Jesus could say no less; but the manifest impossibility of literal fulfilment of the earthly promise (omitted by Matthew and Luke) and especially the significant clause "with persecutions," makes clear that reward, in the sense that Matthew has given to the *logion* by combining with it that of Lk. 22 28—30, is remote from Jesus' mind.[6]

To Jewish and early Christian thought the supreme example of eternal life as a reward of special merit was martyrdom. And in primitive church circles the two sons of Zebedee, James (beheaded by Agrippa in 42) and John (probably martyred in 62 along with the other James, brother of the Lord) were regarded as the martyrs *par excellence* of the apostolic group. As the climax of his section on the religion of Grace vs. the religion of Law and Merit Mark relates the Ambitious Request of James and John, prefacing it by reiteration of Jesus' Prediction of the Cross (10 32—34, 35—45).

Luke's parallel to this anecdote is drawn from a different source, perhaps older than Mark, and is differently placed. Mat-

[6] On the possibility that the source followed by Mark attached at this point the parable of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners (Mt. 20 1-16) see below.

thew shows only his usual softening down of Mark. But we are now concerned only with the motive of Mark, and this is made distinct enough in his version of the *logion* of Lk. 22 25f. Jesus' exemplification of the principle *ministrare non ministrari* is seen not in his attitude at the Supper, where Luke and John place it, but in his martyr death, which was a λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, as the eucharistic ritual *in the Markan and Pauline form* declares (Mk. 14 24 = Mt. 26 28. So 1 Cor. 11 24, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν; but cf. Lk. 22 15—19a, 21 ff., omitting the Pauline interpolation). Mark criticizes the disposition to treat the martyrdom of the two "sons of thunder" as entitling them to positions of special glory in the messianic kingdom. Jesus is not a distributor of heavenly rewards. That is in the hand of God. He can only bid his followers tread his own path of service and suffering in the same fearless faith that it is the path of eternal life.

Certainly there is a marked difference between this Markan group of anecdotes repudiating the principles of Pharisaism, whether as respects obedience to written precept or the reward expected for it, and the neo-legalism of Matthew supplemented by his elaborate pictures of an apocalyptic Son of Man distributing heavenly rewards and punishments from his "throne of glory" (cf. Mt. 7 22f.; 13 40—43; 16 27; 18 23—35; 25 31—46).

The group of anecdotes in Mk. 10 1—45 on The Law, Law and Grace, Eternal Life not won by Obedience to Commandments, Renunciation not giving Claim to Reward, Martyrdom itself only Participation with Christ, certainly stands much nearer to the teaching of Paul (it cannot be too strongly emphasized that the 'Paulinism' of Mark is not a matter of words, or literary dependence à la Werner) than the revision of Matthew; but as a revelation of the evangelist's conception of Jesus' relation to the Law it would not be complete without his closing example of the public teaching of Jesus. For in Mk. 12 28—34 Jesus' reply to the Enquiring Scribe is a counterpart to the story of the Enquiring Pharisee, and stands at the close of Jesus' public teaching, at the threshold of the story of his martyr fate, giving the summing-up of his whole conception of man's duty to God and to his fellow-man.

Just as the enquirer for commandments to observe in 10 17–22 is selected and pictured as a *typical*[7] Pharisee, lovable because his efforts to have the righteousness which is of the Law have brought him to the verge of discipleship without quite attaining it, so the scribe of Mk. 12 28–34, who asks: "Master, what is the great commandment of the Law?" and gives approval to Jesus' answer, is typical of many scribes of whom it could be said that they were "not far from the kingdom of God." The Gamaliel of Acts and the Nicodemus of John were not the only examples known to the early church. Possibly Mark could have told more of the further career of the enquiring scribe, or of the enquiring Pharisee, but he and his readers alike have no more interest in this than Luke or John in the further careers of Gamaliel or Nicodemus after the examples have served the narrator's purpose. And the narrator's purpose is not biography or history, but religion, and more especially the differentiation of the religion of

[7] Neither ancient nor modern homilists can be satisfied to believe this. Targumic interpreters in the *Gospel of the Nazarenes* interject into Mark's story midrashic clauses intended to show that the claim of this enquirer to have "kept the Law and the Prophets" was after all not justified, because the Law and the Prophets call for almsgiving also as an act of "righteousness." The Aramaic evangelist is no better satisfied than the canonical Matthew to admit that if a man really had kept them he was not entitled to "eternal life" (cf. Mt. 19 17). He also therefore rewrites Mark, adding after verse 21: "But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it did not please him. And the Lord said to him, How sayest thou, I have kept the Law and the Prophets? For it is written in the Law: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; and lo, many of thy brethren, the sons of Abraham, are clothed with filthy garments, dying of hunger, and thy house is full of good things, yet nothing at all goeth forth from it to them." Comparison with the rewriting done by canonical Matthew is instructive. Pulpit interpreters in modern times also interject alleviative fancies of their own, to show, in spite of Mark, that the case after all was *not* typical. Jesus, they tell us, had as searcher of hearts, discerned that the besetting sin of this particular young man was avarice. To meet this he imposed (perhaps only as a test) the exceptional requirement. Etc., etc. Ancient and modern *midrash* are alike blind to the fact that by as much as the example chosen is made exceptional the evangelist's case against Pharisaism is weakened.

Christ from types of religion which, however "not far", require for this reason all the more to be distinguished from it.

When we turn from the testimony of Mark as to Jesus' attitude toward the Law to compare with it the testimony of Luke we find it necessary, as in Matthew, to distinguish Luke's personal conception from that of the source he employs. For our third evangelist, writing at about the same period as Matthew, and undertaking in general the same task of supplementing Mark by means of teaching material from S, might be expected to show, as he actually does, the same neo-legalistic animus, though he uses quite different expedients. Thus he manifests the same desire as Matthew to avoid antinomian misuse of the parable of the Slighted Invitation (Lk. 14 15—24 = Mt. 22 1—10). But to counteract misapplication of the closing words "Go forth into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled" the two evangelists use different expedients. Luke adds the two parables of the King unprepared for War and the Builder unable to Finish, prefacing these by the warning against attempts to follow without readiness to renounce all, and following them up with the *logion* on Savorless Salt (Lk. 14 25—35). Matthew attains a similar result by adding a supplement to the parable itself, describing how the "king" came in to view the guests at the "marriage" supper, and, finding there one not furnished with a wedding garment (cf. Rev. 19 8), gave the order "Bind him hand and foot, and cast him out into the outer darkness." For one who had been brought in without the possibility of obtaining a "wedding garment" (which only the pulpit commentators find the means of furnishing) the punishment might be regarded as cruel and unusual. However, we are left in no doubt as to who is responsible for it, because the phrase which follows is too unmistakably Matthean: "There shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth."[8] Both Luke and Matthew are neo-legalists,

[8] This phrase, like "the outer darkness" which precedes it, is borrowed by Matthew from S (Mt. 8 12 = Lk. 13 28). In this original occurrence it meets the requirement of the context, the excluded guests gnashing their

and both include older material of different type. In the case of Luke this pre-Lukan source has been designated L. It is highly instructive to see how L meets the question of Jesus' relation to the Law, in distinction from Luke's view.

It is noticeable that of the group of six anecdotes by which Mark in 10 1—45 and 12 28—34 has set forth his idea of this relation Luke has cancelled approximately half, substituting more or less complete parallels from L. Instead of the subordination of the Mosaic law of divorce to the divine, unwritten law of mercy and good faith in Mk. 10 1—12 we are given in Luke only the fragment Lk. 16 18, though the context (vv. 16f.) betrays Luke's consciousness that the passing of "the Law and the Prophets" is involved. Apparently Luke takes the saying to be a rebuke of the Pharisees for permitting divorce at all.

The saying on receiving the kingdom as a little child is transcribed without material change in Lk. 18 18—23, and the same is true of the story of the Rich Enquirer with comment addressed to the twelve which follows in 18 24—34. Luke merely abbreviates slightly and assimilates the quotation from the ten Commandments to the original by cancelling the Markan addition "Defraud not." We note, however, that Luke omits the statement of Mk. 10 21 that Jesus "looked upon the youth and loved him," and the symbolic promise of Mk. 10 30, indicating that he does not see the bearing of the anecdote on the question of Jesus' relation to the Law, but takes the whole paragraph merely as requiring the sacrifice of worldly goods.

For the remainder of the Markan section Luke is satisfied to supply material from L. True, no significance can be attached to the parallelism between Mk. 10 38b and Lk. 12 50 beyond the fact that Mark (or perhaps, since the clause is also wanting in Matthew, some early transcriber of Mark) has enriched the original "Are ye able to drink my cup?" by adding an allusion

teeth with rage and envy as they see their places taken by outsiders. Matthew, after his habit, stereotypes the phrase and repeats it in no less than five later, and inappropriate, contexts.

to the other sacrament, "or to be baptized with my baptism." But in 22 24–27 Luke gives from L a wholly different version of the *logion Ministrare non ministrari*, making it part of the Supper Teaching; and the story continues with the Q *logion* (based on Ps. 122 5) "Ye shall sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." As Mt. 19 28 attaches the same *logion* (thoroughly rewritten in Matthean phraseology, *παλινγενεσία, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ*) in similar connection we can only infer that both draw from S. Moreover the placing in S can only have been as Luke represents; for the phrasing *διατίθεμαι, καθὼς διέθετο*, is surely chosen with reference to the *διαθήκη* Jesus is instituting. Psychologically and historically Mark's placing of the anecdote may well be preferred, nor need we doubt that his order may often be chronologically better than that of the older source. Nevertheless priority certainly belongs to the Q material, and we must be content to accept the result. In S, the older source, the story of the quarrel for Rank and Reward was not connected, as in Mk. 10 (32–34), 35–45, with the group on Law and Grace, but appeared as part of the Supper Teaching. Jn. 13 1–17 follows this tradition. Matthew's substitution of *ἀκολουθήσαντές μου* for *διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου*, and Mark's addition of *καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*, are obviously secondary. Matthew assimilates to the new context (v. 27, *ἠκολουθήσαμεν*), Mark to that of the Source. The relation of this Q version of the *logion* to that of Mk. 9 35=Lk. 9 48b we need not here investigate.

The L source of Luke is strongly in evidence in his combination of the parable of the Good Samaritan with the last of the Markan anecdotes illustrative of Jesus' relation to the Law (Mk. 12 28–34 = Lk. 10 25–37). Mark's story must again be taken not as exceptional but as typical. Just as the Enquiring Pharisee illustrates Pharisaism at its best, so the Enquiring Scribe illustrates how scribism at its best can be "not far from the kingdom of God." Indeed Jesus' teaching on the whole subject of the Law is brought most effectively to a climax by just this means. The question regarding the Law, Jesus' answer, the scribe's expression of whole-

hearted approval and Jesus' reply: "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God" suggest to the reader as the very climax of the teaching, that if the scribes would only use the Law as here exemplified they might be the means of bringing Israel to repentance.

Luke has made two changes in this Markan anecdote. He has (a) revised the form in a way to express his own neo-legalism, (b) he has added a supplement from L of opposite bearing, that is, one which displays the anti-legalism of the older sources, among which we include Mk., as well as S and L. The inconsistency between L revised and L unrevised constitutes one of the strongest objections to Streeter's view of the relation, viz, that Luke himself, our third evangelist, is the writer of both, the present Gospel being only an expansion of Luke's own earlier work prepared before he had become acquainted with the Gospel of Mark.

In rewriting Mk. 12 28—31 Luke gives it the same neo-legalistic twist that Matthew has given to Jesus' answer to the enquiring Pharisee, viz, the assurance that observance of the Christianized Law *does* entitle to "eternal life." Having drawn from the scribe (who is represented in v. 25 as asking not in good faith but "to tempt him," or "put him to the test") the desired passage from the Law Jesus is made by Luke to say in so many words: "Thou hast answered well; *this do and thou shalt live.*" Surely there is little difference to be found between this conception of the gospel message and that of Mt. 19 17 b—19.

The story of the Enquiring Scribe in Lk. 10 25—28 is either a Lukan adaptation of Mk. 12 28—31, or a pre-Lukan adaptation of pre-Markan material, this latter being a decidedly complicated theory to maintain. Either way the use of it as a framework for the parable of the Good Samaritan produces an egregious misfit. The parable does *not* answer the question it is supposed to answer, "Who is my neighbor?" To make it do so Samaritan and victim would have to exchange parts, so as to teach the extension of the term "neighbor" even to one who in Lk. 17 18 is called an "alien" (ἀλλογενής). On the contrary the parable intrinsically answers the question, "Who is the true exponent of divine law?" And the answer is based on the same 'prophetic'

principle which we have seen in Mk. and Q to be characteristic of Jesus. Its real teaching is that not the priest or Levite, who in the O.T. is the official expounder of the Law, is worthy to be so regarded unless he shows mercy. Even the "alien" is a better teacher if he be an imitator of God and walk in love toward his fellow-man. He who conceived the parable of the Good Samaritan had the same attitude toward the Law as he who uttered the great discourse on the Righteousness of Sons. He stands with Isaiah against mere book-religion. But the application of it made in Lk. 10 25—28 is as far from this as Matthew's application of Jesus' saying about divorce. Jesus with Malachi regards mercy and good faith as laws of God capable of holding together marital relations which human ordinances put asunder. Matthew reports the great saying as if Jesus were merely taking sides with Shammai against Hillel.

We have referred above to another *logion* of L in Lk. 17 7—10, which if not at odds with its context is out of all relation to it, and which reflects the same doctrine of 'grace' in opposition to legalism as our Gospel of Mark. Perhaps these two, taken together with the famous example of the Elder Brother of the parable complaining of the undeserved favors extended to the repentant prodigal (Lk. 15 11—32), and the equally conspicuous instance of the Thief on the Cross (Lk. 23 39—43), should suffice to show that whatever the attitude of the third evangelist himself to this question of merit vs. grace, L, the peculiar material which Luke uses but which is not traceable elsewhere, has the same anti-legalistic animus as Mark.

But if it be true of Luke that his source sometimes displays a less legalistic attitude than his own this is even more conspicuously the case with Matthew. The parable of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners (Mt. 20 1—16) does such violence to the traditional feeling of merit as the only proper basis for God's treatment of men that we are surprised to find it admitted to any of the canonical Gospels, most of all to the pages of Matthew, with whose doctrine of reward proportioned to "good works" it ill consorts. The explanation of its admission would seem to be that to Matthew the

parable merely illustrates the *logion* which he places before it and again repeats at its close, "The last shall be first, and the first last." To Matthew (if we may judge by 21 43) the parable was simply a prediction of the substitution of a new people of God after the original heirs of the promise had proved their unworthiness. Its intrinsic bearing is as obviously opposed to the neo-legalism of Matthew as the bearing of the parable of the Good Samaritan to the neo-legalism of Luke. As a shaft aimed at the heart of the Pharisaic doctrine of salvation by merit it goes hand in hand with the parable of the Prodigal Son. Its closing word, "Is thine eye evil because I am good?" might have been addressed by the father in Luke's parable to the grudging elder brother.

The placing of this parable of the Dissatisfied Wage-earners is also significant. It forms in Matthew the close of the Markan group whose purpose we have defined to be The Religion of Grace vs. the Religion of Merit. At least, then, Matthew has given it the place belonging to it, though he seems blind to its true significance.

But perhaps it will be said that this alleged blindness is unproved. There may even be those who regard it as a slander to ascribe to this evangelist a neo-lēgalistic animus. The question can only be decided by consideration of all the evidence. We have three ways of determining what Matthew's propensity really is on this all-important question of the apostolic age: (1) By the general structure and composition of his Gospel, taken together with peculiarly Matthean expressions, such as the closing parable attached to the seven-fold group of Parables of the Kingdom constituting his third 'Sermon', and the closing words of his Gospel (Mt. 28 20). To most critics these phenomena suffice to show that to Matthew's mind the Christian message is a promulgation of the *nova lex*, i. e. the Torah of Moses amplified and spiritualized by Jesus. On this point agreement of expositors is so general that we need hardly expatiate upon the points already adduced, fear and hatred of the teachings of "lawlessness" from which the Church is suffering in his time, reiteration with redoubled emphasis of the doctrine of rewards and penalties in the world

to come, where "good works" are to be the sole basis of judgment. That Matthew's Gospel is distinctively Jewish-Christian in these particulars hardly calls for further demonstration.

(2) A second means of determining the distinctively "Matthean" viewpoint is comparison with Mark; for in addition to the general supplementation shared with Luke from the Second Source, wherein Matthew evinces a clear sense of Markan deficiencies on the side of teaching material, we have a series of detailed changes particularly affecting those portions of Mark where the more radical representations of the Roman evangelist come into the foreground. It will conduce to clarity if we consider these in the reverse order of their occurrence in Mark.

Mt. 19 16–22 gives a typical 'reversed vision' of the story of the Rich Enquirer, which, as we have seen, occupies the central place in Mark's group of anecdotes illustrative of Law and Grace. The method used combines Jesus' answer to the enquiring Pharisee of Mk. 10 17–22 with his answer to the enquiring scribe of Mk. 12 28–34. The result may best be shown by placing the two versions in parallel columns. In so doing we reverse the misleading habit of traditional practice, restoring to Mark that position in the left-hand column to which it is entitled by priority of date, and indicate by italics the changes introduced by Matthew.

Mk. 10 17–22	Mt. 19 16–22
17 And as he was going forth into the way a man ran up and kneeled to him and asked him: Good Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life? 18 And Jesus said to him, Why callest thou me 'good'? There is none 'good' save God only. 19 Thou knowest the commandments: Commit no adultery, no murder, no theft, bear no false witness, defraud not, honor thy father and thy mother. 20 But he said to him, Teacher, I have observed all these from my boyhood. 21 And Jesus looked upon him and	16 And lo, a man came up to him and said, Teacher, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? 17 But he said to him, *Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?* One alone is 'good'. *But if thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments.* 18 *He saith to him, Which?* And Jesus said, The law "Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness. 19 Honor thy father and thy mother," *and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."* 20 The

loved him, and said to him, One thing thou lackest, Go, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come, follow me. 22 But he was downcast at the saying, and went away grieved, for it happened that he had great wealth.

young man saith to him: I have kept all these, wherein am I still lacking? 21 Jesus saith to him, *If thou desirest to be complete,* Go, sell all that thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven, and come, follow me. 22 And when he heard it the youth went away grieved, for it happened that he had great wealth.

Matthew has rewritten the story in such a way as to answer the question, What is the way of eternal life? in a sense almost opposite to Mark's. Disregarding his minor modifications, such as the avoidance of Jesus' apparent deprecation of the designation 'good' in application to himself, we note his change of Jesus' answer from a denial that obedience to the Mosaic commandment gives claim to eternal life, to a positive affirmation that it *does* give such a claim, if in addition to the Mosaic decalogue one observe also the Christian Law of Love. There remains, after this change, no more room for the inculcation of self-surrender in the dedication of goods and life save as a counsel of perfection. But Matthew does not shrink even from this, carrying further the double standard advanced in verses 10—12. The very expression εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι recalls the writer of 5 48. The neo-legalistic conception of the gospel as an addition of new to old also recalls the writer of 5 17—20 and 13 51 f.

Continuing with the same Markan group we find the phraseology of Matthew still more conspicuous in his recast of the Q promise Mt. 19 28 = Lk. 22 28—30 by which he supplements Mark's assurance of reward to the apostles for their following (Mk. 10 28); cf. Mt. 25 31. The motive of the addition is self-evident. But it has no direct bearing on the question of Law vs. Grace.

More important is it for our purpose to observe Matthew's rearrangement of Mark's story of the Question concerning Divorce (Mk. 10 1—12 = Mt. 19 1—12). By transposition to the end (vv. 7—8) of the verses which Mark had prefixed (vv. 3—5), and by addition of the clauses κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν in v. 3 and μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ in

v. 9, Matthew completely changes the picture. Jesus is no longer the prophet upholding the eternal divine principle of marital fidelity against the written ordinances of men, no longer a Malachi crying by the authority of conscience, "Jehovah hateth putting away," but is made to descend into the arena of scribal casuistry. In Matthew Jesus becomes a second Moses, pronouncing on the moot point of the two contemporary schools of scribal interpretation. He favors the strict constructionists of Dt. 24 1.

The treatment of Mk. 7 1–23 in Mt. 15 1–20 resembles that of Mk. 10 1–12 in Mt. 19 1–12. We expect, of course, omission of Mark's somewhat contemptuous description of Jewish ritual purifications in verses 2–4; but this is followed by a transposition of verses 9–13 placing them before verses 6–8. The effect is to rebuke the scribes and Pharisees for having constructed a hedge about the Law which instead of bearing it out is contrary to its spirit. Verses 12–14 add a prediction that such additions will be "rooted up" and the blind Pharisee will follow his blind guide, the scribe, into the ditch. The comment of Mk. 7 19b on the *logion* about inward cleanness, that Jesus thus abolished the Jewish 'distinctions of meats' also is of course omitted by Matthew. For to Matthew the distinction to be made is not that of Mark between the unwritten, inward law of God, and the imperfect attempts of men to codify it in "ordinances." To him the distinction is between a divine written Torah given to Moses, a "planting of the heavenly Father," and an unwritten Mishnah, a tradition of men which must be "rooted up" because it conflicts with the "commandment of God." Matthew has no disapproval even for the institution of official interpreters giving authoritative *halacha* from "Moses' Seat," if it be a *halacha* which is both correct and sincere (23 1–3). In fact that is to be the chief function of the Twelve. They are to be "scribes well instructed unto the kingdom of Heaven," so combining the former revelation with "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven" as to be able to bring out of their storehouses things both new and old (13 51f.). At the head of this apostolic company stands Peter, endowed with the scribal authority of "the keys of the kingdom of heaven." He presides

over the group, like a *Tanna* over the college of scribes, and his pronouncements as to what is obligatory and what is not have even greater authority. "Whatsoever thou shalt 'bind' on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt 'loose' on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (16 19). This goes a step beyond even the Lukan attempt to endow the college of "apostles and elders" in Jerusalem with authority to "bind and loose" for the church at large (Acts 15 22—29).

(3) Our third means of determining the view-point of Matthew is his treatment of the Second Source. The question is a delicate one, since our only evidence for change is the witness of Luke, who himself may not always reflect the original. However, since both Luke and Matthew are affected, as we have seen, by the neo-legalistic tendencies of their age, differing only in degree in their precautions against moral laxity, we are not likely to go astray if we follow in each case the witness who displays less of this tendency. Moreover we have now the invaluable guide of Matthew's treatment of Mark. Observing how passages from Mark's Gospel bearing on this moot point of Jesus' relation to the Law have been rewritten we have every reason to expect that passages taken from the Second Source have undergone the same process. In cases where Matthew departs from Luke in the form he gives to the Q material, if the motive appears to be the same, if in addition the style, phraseology and standpoint are the same as in his departures from Mark, it will be safe to say that the Jewish-Christian evangelist himself, not some hitherto unknown source or form of the Second Source, is responsible. Such appears to be the case in marked degree in the so-called Sermon on the Mount, the great discourse of the first 'book' of Matthew, whose object is to present the whole duty of the Christian disciple in a new Torah, higher than that of Moses. The whole discourse consists of non-Markan material.

The variations of Matthew from Luke in reporting the discourse on the Righteousness of Sons have been studied individually in my own volume *The Sermon on the Mount* (1902), that of Professor C. W. Votaw of similar date and title, and the excellent

recent work of Marriott. The changes can only be enumerated here, but detailed study will show a consistent viewpoint and will more and more justify the conclusion, that a much larger responsibility for changes devolves upon this evangelist personally than Streeter and others are willing to grant. Viewed in comparison with the entire body of editorial material attributable to R^{mt}, the additions do not seem to exceed in amount and character what appears in similar connections from his hand elsewhere. No occasion therefore appears for recourse to a hypothetical outside source.

1. Matthew changes the Eight Congratulations and Woes of Lk. 6 20—26 into Eight Promises to those who fulfil the New Law. Two of the added promises are drawn from the Old Testament (Mt. 5 5 = Ps. 37 11; 5 8 = Ps. 24 4), the other two introduce a precept of peculiar importance to this particular evangelist (with 5 7 and 9 cf. 5 23 f.; 6 14 f.; 18 21—25 and Sirach 35 1—3). The Q Beatitudes in verses 3 f., 6 and 10 receive verbal modifications adapting them to the Matthean conception (*δικαιοσύνη* in v. 10 is Matthean).

2. Matthew prefixes to the comparison of the Righteousness of Sons with current ethics an elaborate agglutination in two parts: a) an Exhortation to Disciples to set an example of "good works" (5 13—16); b) a Defense of Jesus against the charge of "loosing" the Law and the Prophets (17—20, note *δικαιοσύνη* in v. 20).

3. Matthew appends after the comparison two long sections which deal with Reward in Heaven: a) a Warning against Externality in acts of worship (6 1—18, note *δικαιοσύνη* in v. 1 and the refrain "Thy Father . . . shall reward thee"); b) an Exhortation to lay up Treasure in Heaven (19—34, note the addition *καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ* in v. 33). As in 5 13—20 the material is drawn from authentic sources (largely Q), but the adaptation and, in part, the wording are Matthean.

4. Matthew has three additions to close this section: a) a Deprecation of too great zeal to win converts among the heathen (7 6; cf. 10 5 f.); b) an Assurance of answer to prayer (7—11, the

unused part of the Q section interjected in 6 9–13); c) the displaced summary v. 12 = Lk. 6 31 expanded by the editorial clause, "For this is the Law and the Prophets;" cf. 5 17.

5. Matthew prefixes to the closing parable of the discourse on The Righteousness of Sons a sure Foundation (7 24–27 = Lk. 6 47–49) a long Warning against the teachers of "Lawlessness" (ἀνομία), using as an authentic nucleus the plea of the discourse for radical change of nature instead of merely external reform (v. 17 f. = Lk. 6 43 f.), and expanding by a complete rewriting of the Q discourse on the urgency of immediate repentance (7 13 f. = Lk. 13 22–25).

A careful study of these five main changes made by our first evangelist in adapting the Q discourse on the Righteousness of Sons to his conception of the whole duty of the Christian disciple will certainly confirm the opinion we should draw from the closing verse of his Gospel regarding his view of the nature of the Christian message as a new and higher Torah. It will also make clearer than before his strongly neo-legalistic propensities, as reflected in the changes made by him in Mark's story of the Enquiring Pharisee. Finally it should go far to remove the scruples felt by many critics, especially English critics, against ascribing the rewriting of such a parable as Mk. 4 26–29 in Mt. 13 24–32 to the individual initiative of the Jewish-Christian evangelist, or the actual composition (not of course without an authentic nucleus) of such supplements to the discourses as Mt. 13 34–52; 18 23–35; and 25 31–46. The changes are too consistent in purpose and uniform in style to have been drawn in from outside sources. Aside from minute nuclei of traditional material they are the work of the evangelist himself.

The net result of our enquiry is that Matthew's attempt to counteract the antinomian laxity of the times and to correct the radicalism of the Roman evangelist has overshot the mark. He is far from doing justice to the historic Jesus by depicting him as a second Moses, laying down commandments for a higher righteousness enforced by rewards and penalties of the world to come. Matthew's age is the age of the Pastoral Epistles, James

and Jude; his special mode of combatting the common evil stands closest to Jude, while Luke's stands closer to James. It is true that Jesus was no iconoclast, that from the Gospel of Mark alone we might reach a false conception of his attitude; but the neo-legalism of Matthew goes much further astray. It misses the essential point, the vital sympathy of Jesus with the protest of the great prophets of the post-Deuteronomic age against the substitution of book-religion for the present teaching of the living God of goodness and truth. Missing this we miss the main clue to the conversion of Paul and his devotion to the Way of Jesus. Led back to it as we shall be when Gospel criticism shall have brought home to us the necessary inferences from its first great accepted result, the priority of Mark, we shall have begun to undo something of the damage and misunderstanding which for eighteen centuries have flowed from the false assumption that in this relatively late and Jewish-Christian Gospel the Church had the record of the life and teaching of Jesus in its most authentic and authoritative form.

It would be rash for one who in the field of Prof. Geo. F. Moore's *Judaism in the First Christian Centuries* (1927) is scarcely more than an amateur to express a judgment. Yet our attempt to go behind the later Synoptists to sources which more nearly express the attitude of Jesus and Paul on the great question of the relation of Law and Grace involves the necessity of forming such a judgment. If we are right in thinking the rewriting of Mark by Matthew and Luke to be due in no small degree to the effort of the post-apostolic Church to resist the growth of antinomian laxity, and that the real standpoint of Jesus was nearer than they represent to the standpoint of Paul, nearer still to that of Isaiah and the prophets, it involves support for the criticism of Moore's monumental work offered by an honored colleague under the title "Judaism in New Testament Times" in *The Journal of Religion* VIII. 1 (Jan., 1928, p. 61). Prof. F. C. Porter therein expresses as follows his sense that Jesus and Paul are essentially at one in their revolt against the tendencies of Judaism in their time to become a religion of the book:

> The Mishnah is the classical expression of a religion of a book, a religion of authority. The New Testament is the classic of a religion of a person, a religion of inwardness and freedom. I may be permitted to express my own conviction—it may seem just now a historical heresy—that this difference goes back to Jesus and was made by him, and that Paul is fundamentally right in his understanding of what the difference was and of what it signifies. In these statements I have gone outside of the region in which a discussion of Moore's *Judaism* should move. It is not, however, beyond the range of this discussion to express the two opinions that Jesus was not orthodox, and that Paul was not ignorant of Judaism.

If our study of the neo-legalism of Matthew lends confirmation to Professor Porter's well chosen words this alone would suffice to justify its publication.

1 COR. 13 12, βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι

SAMUEL E. BASSETT
UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

MOST modern interpreters of this passage would probably agree on a rendering something like this: "Now we see (reality, the life eternal) as the reflection in a mirror, as an enigma." There is, to be sure, a tendency to emphasize the imperfection of the image in ancient mirrors generally, and particularly in those which the Corinthians could purchase.[1] Robertson and Plummer see an incongruity in the mixture of metaphors, βλέπομεν ἐν αἰνίγματι, and Preuschen[2] suggests the rejection of the last two words. All modern interpretations, however, agree in giving to αἴνιγμα its negative signification, a dark saying, a riddle, something which baffles. I wish to suggest that the positive meaning of αἴνιγμα, as the expression of an underlying truth, should be included in the interpretation; that there are reasons for thinking that St. Paul meant it to be understood thus, and that the passage thereby gains in significance.

I

The positive signification of αἴνιγμα, and of words derived from the same root, is found, along with the negative meaning,

[1] This introduces a modern idea into the interpretation. That the ancients did not think of the imperfection of the image in a mirror is indicated by Jas. 1 23, ἀνδρὶ κατανοοῦντι τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ, κατενόησεν γὰρ ἑαυτόν.

[2] Bachmann, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*[2] (1910), 405, Anm. 2.

all through the history of the Greek language. It is, in fact, the primary meaning. The negative signification, an obscure saying, is not explicit in the word, but is a secondary meaning, derived by implication from the tendency of the *αἴνιγμα* to be obscure. The primary meaning, which was preserved long after the time of St. Paul, has nothing in common with our word, 'enigmatical'. This is clear from the derivation of the word. *αἴνιγμα* is a regularly-formed noun denoting result, from the verb *αἰνίττομαι*. This verb, a by-form of *αἰνίζομαι*, means, literally, 'produce an *αἶνος*.' Now an *αἶνος* was a fable, whose purpose was to convey a truth by means of a tale, that is, to give a picture of a truth.[3]

The words *αἰνίττομαι*, *αἴνιγμα*, *αἰνιγμός*, and the like, while often implying obscure utterance, still preserve the idea of figurative or illustrated truth: Arist. *Rhet.* 3, 1405b 4, *μεταφοραὶ γὰρ αἰνίττονται*, 'metaphors suggest the truth'—in the context Aristotle cannot mean that they obscure the truth. This positive connotation of the word is supported by some of the definitions given by the old lexicographers. Hesychius explains *αἴνιγμα* as *ἔμφατον*, which is the implication of a meaning not explicit in the words. Timaeus, *Lex.*, compares it with *ὑπόνοια*, 'hidden meaning', or with an allegory. *Etym. Mag.* 36, 31, explains it as a parable. Sometimes the positive overshadows the negative meaning: Ar. *Peace*, 47, 'The dung-beetle means (*αἰνίττεται ἐς*) Cleon', that is, Cleon resembles the dung-beetle. In fact, Hesychius equates *αἰνίγματα* with *ὁμοιώματα*, 'resemblances'. In Ar. *Frogs*, 61, Dionysus cannot describe to Heracles his yearning for Euripides, but he makes his meaning clear *δι' αἰνιγμῶν*, 'by an illustration' as the sequel proves, for he compares his own longings to Heracles' craving for pea-soup. *αἴνιγμα*, therefore, in its positive aspect expressed the semblance of the truth, but in the language of fancy. This meaning it kept till the end of antiquity: Arethas,

[3] The assumed connection of *αἴνιγμα* with the adjective *αἰνός*, 'dread' (Abbott-Smith, *A Manual Lexicon of the New Testament*, 1922), is not recognized by etymologists of authority.

On the Apocalypse, Ch. XVII, p. 707 D, ἡ λευκὴ στολὴ αἴνιγμα τοῦ κεκαθάρθαι, 'The white robe is the symbol of the purified state.'[4]

II

The evidence just presented merely shows that αἴνιγμα along with its negative meaning of 'dark saying' may also have the positive signification of a real truth expressed in terms that describe a concrete instance, that is, truth clothed in the language of imagery. We must next investigate the possibility or the probability that St. Paul had in mind also this positive meaning. The first evidence that we find in favor of this view is in certain of the early translations. In the Bohairic version our passage is interpreted as meaning, "For now we see through (by means of) a glass (mirror) in a likeness."[5] The Sahidic rendering of ἐν αἰνίγματι means 'in an image'.[6] In Syriac the Peshitta version is thus rendered in English: "Now we see as by means of a mirror in (or, by) a parable (or, allegory)."[7] Of course this kind of evidence proves

[4] Here the use of αἴνιγμα is almost as 'incongruous' as Robertson and Plummer find it in 1 Cor. 13 12. But to pass from 'symbolic statement' to 'symbol' is easy. In Num. 12 8 (see below, p. 235) the antithesis ἐν εἴδει)(δι' αἰνιγμάτων indicates a similar transference of meaning from the sphere of language to that of sight.

[5] *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect*, Oxford 1905, p. 179. The alternative renderings included in parentheses were given to me by Professor Hatch. See Note 7.

[6] *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect*, Oxford 1920, p. 283, renders, 'in an outline'. Professor Bacon prefers 'in a figure'. The rendering, 'in an image', is that of Professor Hatch. See Note 7.

[7] The translation is that of Professor W. H. P. Hatch of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, who brought to my attention the Syriac version, and kindly gave me his renderings of the two Coptic versions. Professor Hatch also contributes the following illuminating comment on αἴνιγμα: "αἴνιγμα in the LXX renders the Hebrew חִידָה, which means not only a riddle, but also an allegory, an allegorical or figurative saying. Cf. Num. 12 8; Prov. 1 6. The latter passage, though not referred to by the commentators (so far as I have noticed), seems to me instructive on account of the parallelism. The word translated 'figure' in the R. V. (מְלִיצָה) is

nothing with regard to what St. Paul meant by the words ἐν αἰνίγματι. But it does show unmistakably that the phrase permits of this interpretation.

The probability that St. Paul intended the phrase ἐν αἰνίγματι to convey this meaning rests on parallels in literature which are likely to have suggested to him the figure which he uses in 1 Cor. 13 12. The student of Greek at once thinks of Plato's simile of the Cave (*Resp.* 514 A). If this were known to St. Paul, our interpretation would need little further support. But modern scholars are generally agreed that St. Paul did not know Greek literature at first-hand.[8] It is more likely, as is generally recognized, that he had in mind LXX Num. 12 8. There Jehovah is defending Moses against Miriam and Aaron, and says: "To other prophets I appear in visions and speak in dreams. But with Moses I speak mouth to mouth, in my own likeness (ἐν εἴδει) and not δι' αἰνιγμάτων." The αἰνίγματα through which Jehovah talks with other prophets are visions and dreams—here again αἰνίγματα refers, to some degree at least, to the phenomena of sight, rather than of speech. Dreams and visions are difficult to understand, it is true, but nevertheless they impart the truth, for the prophet's vision or dream reveals to him the word of God, though wrapped in figurative

interpreted by some to mean a satire or satirical poem. But I think you are safe in taking it in the sense of 'figure.' I have collected a few opinions, on which you can rely for the sense of the word. 'Rede . . . in Bildern'—Wildeboer; 'gedrehter, verschlungener, daher rätselhafter Lehrspruch'—Strack; 'a turned figurative saying, one that looks toward another sense'—Toy. Hence, on account of the parallelism, the Hebrew word (חִידֹת), which is translated by αἴνιγμα in the LXX and by 'dark sayings' in the R. V., must mean figurative sayings. This passage then is in line with the Peshitta version's interpretation of ἐν αἰνίγματι in 1 Cor. 13 12. Num. 12 8 is also instructive, where δι' αἰνιγμάτων (בְּחִידֹת) is contrasted with ἐν εἴδει (מַרְאֶה)."

In this connection I wish also to acknowledge my obligation to Professor Benjamin W. Bacon of Yale University for helpful suggestions in preparing this paper.

[8] Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, II, 158, where other authorities are cited. I have not seen Rendel Harris, *St. Paul and Greek Literature*, London 1927.

language and expressed in pictures. The chief point of the passage is that other prophets see Jehovah only in an image; Moses sees him as he is. This is a close parallel to the meaning which our proposed interpretation gives to 1 Cor. 13 12.

III

By recognizing both the positive and the negative meanings of *αἴνιγμα* the whole context gains in clarity and in significance. Human knowledge, St. Paul says, changes at different stages of human existence. The child sees reality in one way, the man in another. In this life we human beings see reality only as in a mirror. The mirror shows us only the reflection of reality. This reflection is, as it were, an *αἴνιγμα*; it must be interpreted and may not be interpreted rightly, for it is hard to interpret; but nevertheless, it is what a mirror shows, a likeness, a resemblance. It is reality wrapped in imagery, like an allegory. All human knowledge must be expressed figuratively, in the form of myth or fable or other likeness of the truth. Santayana remarks[9] that even the truths of science are expressed in 'myths', in fact, he says that 'wise myths' report the movement of the world's thought. This means that the partial, changing knowledge of mortals is never more than a picture of the truth, the truth expressed *ἐν αἰνίγματι*. If we interpret the phrase thus, St. Paul's third illustration of the relation between human knowledge and reality becomes more intelligible: "Now I know in part, but then (when this mortal shall have put on immortality) shall I know (the truth, reality, God) even as I (before I put on immortality) was recognized."[10], that is, 'I shall not have to interpret the reflection, the likeness of reality, but I shall see it face to face, as Moses saw Jehovah.'

[9] *A Long Way Round to Nirvana, The Dial*, November 1923, p. 438.

[10] To one who is more familiar with Greek than with the interpretation of the New Testament it is hard to see the reason for supplying *ὑπὸ θεοῦ* with *ἐπεγνώσθην*. The verb *ἐπιγινώσκω* is used in both the N. T. and the LXX in the sense of 'recognize (the identity of a person or thing)': *Luke* 24 16; Acts 12 14; Gen. 42 7, 8.

THE ODOR OF THE SPIRIT AT PENTECOST

HENRY J. CADBURY
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

AMONG the many conveniences for the textual study of Acts, provided in Professor J. H. Ropes's recent edition[1] are the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus and, printed opposite, quotations from the Commentary of Ephrem in a catena. Both the catena and the commentary are known to us only in Armenian, and in using the modern English or Latin rendering of them made by the late Professor F. C. Conybeare one realizes that we are two removes at least from the original Syriac.

The particular item to be discussed in this paper is fortunately so well attested that there can be no doubt of its genuine Ephremic character. In both the commentary and the catena, there are repeated references to a smell or fragrance at Pentecost. In the commentary we have three times reference made to the three external proofs of the fulfilment of the passage in Joel: (1) vox superna et odor internus et linguae quae inter nos omnes loquuntur. (2) vox et odor omnesque linguae quibus iam ante vos loquimur. (3) et e voce quam audistis, et odore fragrantiae quem accipitis, et omnibus linguis quas loquimur et auditis.[2]

In the fragments of the Catena occur no less than six references to the smell: (1) "A sweet smell exhaled from the violence of the wind

[1] *The Beginnings of Christianity*, edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, Part. I. *The Acts of the Apostles* Vol. III. *The Text of Acts* by J. H. Ropes (1926).

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 396.

and filled all the house." (2) "And how did the wind fill the house? Evidently with a sweet odour and brilliant light." (3) "In various forms it appears, for not a wind and smell and light only, but tongues visible they saw, and these like fire, to indicate many persons through fire." (4) "The voice which came from heaven was audible to all citizens, and the smell which exhaled from the violence of the wind collected the many together." (5) "These same people whom the dread sound stirred and the fragrant smell led gathered together." (6) "And to us is witness the violent sound which resounded, and the sweet odour which exhaled, and the strange tongues we speak."[3]

There can be no doubt that the story of Pentecost as known to Ephrem referred to an odor. Whence came that smell into his thinking about Acts? This query is the cause of the following study.

The first suggestion that comes to our mind is that there was an addition of some sort in the underlying text. None of the variants in the passage in Greek or Latin (not even those of the Western Text with which Ephrem so often agrees) give any clue. Rendel Harris voiced this conjecture when he said, "We may suspect there was something in the text which provoked the comment about the sweet smell. Was it an assimilation to Isaiah vi. 'The house was filled with smoke,' viz. of incense?"[4]

It is perhaps some objection to this that the smoke at Isaiah's vision is not necessarily the smoke of incense. But should we adopt this suggestion we might then appeal to the fact that the passage from Joel quoted a bit later as fulfilled includes the words "blood and fire and vapour of smoke" (ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ). And the

[3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 397, 399. Of these six passages the second is headed Nyss-Ephrem, the third Nazianzen. "But Nazianzen is no more likely than the other Gregory to have had a reference to the odour of sanctity in his text of Acts, and we may suspect here the influence of Ephrem." So wrote Conybeare, but the present investigation makes it less certain that the idea could not have been held by the Cappadocian as well as the Syriac fathers.

[4] J. Rendel Harris, *Four Lectures on the Western Text of the New Testament*, London (1894), p. 38 *note*.

catena (unlike Codex Bezae) does not omit these words. But in Joel certainly, whatever we think of Isaiah, smoke is not the pleasant smell of incense.

If assimilation of Acts to another passage of Scripture is to be thought of, a better suggestion would be John 12 3. Again here we have a reference as in Isaiah and in Acts to the filling of the house: "The house was filled with the odor of the ointment" (*τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μύρου*). It is the synoptic story of the anointing of Jesus. Among the additions of John's version of the incident is this sentence. It may be a vivid detail, but it may also be a symbolical item of deep meaning.

It is of course possible that without any influence from other Biblical passages the Greek and Syriac texts before Ephrem Syrus became interpolated. It is worth while, however, to see whether by any possibility the present text could give rise to the idea of an odor.

There is for example the Greek word *πνοή*. It is usually translated here 'wind.' Augustine and Cyprian have *flatus* and the Vulgate *spiritus* and certainly *πνοή* in current Greek ought to mean 'breath' rather than 'wind' (*ventus*). But what breath or breathing can be meant? Of course the winds are spoken of as having breath. One can speak of the *πνοὴ ἀνεμῶν* as in the Apology of Aristides V. 4 and 5, and of *ἡ πνοὴ τοῦ Ζεφύρου* in pagan Greek poetry. But *πνοή* alone meaning a wind or gust of wind is not common, to say the least.

Could not *πνοή* itself mean smell? On the whole this meaning seems no more far fetched than the usual one of 'wind.' Certainly secular Greek uses both verb (*πνέω*) and noun (*πνοή*) poetically of smell. The instances in the dictionaries are mostly from tragedy and comedy and are doubtless poetic. But in vernacular Greek poetic diction often becomes prose.

One could regard the *πνοῆς φερομένης* not as a genitive dependent on *ἦχος* but as a genitive absolute. In Syriac the *πνοῆς* would become the nominative (as it is in the Peshitto) and the subject of 'filled,' since it becomes the nearest antecedent. We could render our Greek: "then came suddenly a sound from heaven

while as it were a strong smell exhaled." I am not sure that *βιαίας* would be used of smells,[5] otherwise the translation might well have been that of Ephrem's Syriac. It will be observed that the 'exhaled' of his comments would thus go back to *φερομένης*.

It may be argued against this that Ephrem mentions both the wind and the smell, and hence cannot have gotten his smell from *πνοή*. But two possibilities exist. Perhaps his Syriac translated the difficult[6] *πνοή* by two nouns instead of one. It is a habit of translators to do just this with obscure or ambiguous words in their originals. Or perhaps the catena in mentioning both wind and smell is therein conflate, a combination of two commentators, or of the commentator and of the text as usually interpreted. It should be observed that the continuous commentary of Ephrem as distinct from the catena has no allusion to a wind at all, but only to the smell. Along with the voice and the tongues it is the principal phenomenon.

An alternative suggestion is that the change is due to a scribal error in the Syriac. If *πνοή* is to be understood as wind, the Old Syriac would doubtless use to translate it רוּח, ܪܘܚ, ܪܘܚܐ. But the word for smell in Syriac differs by but one letter: רֵיח, ܪܝܚ, ܪܝܚܐ. This is, for example, the word used in John 12 3. An interchange of these two words in the Syriac translation would explain the whole origin of the smell.

[5] It is not used of smells, for example, in Theophrastus, *De odoribus*, who enumerates the adjectives applied to smells (1 § 2) as *δριμύς*, *ἰσχυρός*, *μαλακός*, *γλυκύς*, *βαρύς*. But *βίαιος* when once translated into another language might be appropriate to smells. Of course *βιαίας* and *φερομένης* both suit 'wind.' See H. B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament* (1910), p. 70, *notes* 4 and 5. Many illustrations of both verb and adjective in this connection can be found.

[6] I think *πνοή* in this passage may be called difficult. It is not so obvious as one commonly assumes in reading one's Greek Testament that here it means wind. I was puzzled by it before I knew of Ephrem's treatment of the passage. And I once played with the suggestion here that it meant a deep breathing. There is one other occurrence in the New Testament and in this writer at Acts 17 25 in the paronomasia *ζωὴν καὶ πνοήν*.

Whatever the extent to which the text of Acts offered an excuse for finding an odor at Pentecost, it is probable that Ephrem's reference is also affected by the existence of a recognized rôle for odors in the history of religion. On this subject we may turn to the comprehensive monograph of Ernst Lohmeyer, *Vom göttlichen Wohlgeruch.*[7] He has collected evidence for divine odors as found in the Greek and Roman mythology, in Egyptian religion, in Persian religion, in Judaism and to some extent in Christianity. The characteristic place of smell in the earlier religions he summarizes as follows:

> Die Vorstellung vom göttlichen Wohlgeruch ist nicht eine besondere Anschauung einer bestimmten Religion, sondern eine allgemeine verschiedener antiken Religionen. Der Wohlgeruch ist in ihnen Merkmal göttlichen Lebens, Zeichen göttlicher Nähe, Form göttlicher Offenbarung. Die besondere Art und Gestalt, die die Vorstellung in den einzelnen Religionen gewonnen hat, wird durch die Art der Gottesanschauung bestimmt: wie in einem kleineren Bilde verdichtet sich in dem Duftsymbol das Wesen, der lebendige Hauch jeder Religiosität. Das Symbol hat in Griechenland seine menschlichste, sinnlichste und sinnvollste Deutung erfahren; in Ägypten ist es am engsten mit Opfergedanken und den Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode verbunden. In der persischen Religion ist es zu einem Bilde sittlicher Kräfte geworden.[8]

There are different parts played by the odor. Very general is the mention of a sweet smell at the appearance of the deity[9] (and conversely of an evil smell at the appearance of an unfriendly spirit or demon). Perhaps the most familiar passage is Virgil's description of the epiphany of Venus to Aeneas:

> Dixit, se avertens rosea cervice refulsit,
> ambrosiaeque comae divinum vertice odorem
> spiravere.[10]

[7] *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften.* Philosophisch-historische Klasse, X (1919), 9. Abhandlung.

[8] Lohmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

[9] Cf. E. Pfister "Epiphanie" in Pauly-Wissowa, Supplementband IV (1924), especially § 40, col. 316.

[10] *Aeneid*, I, 402ff. Cf. Ovid *Fast.* V, 375f. (327f.) of the goddess Flora:

> Omnia finierat; tenues secessit in auras.
> Mansit odor; posses scire fuisse deam.

Places that the god haunts[11] share this smell and of course the god's robes[12] or hair are redolent. The same ideas occur in Egyptian literature over a period of several millennia.

The aspect of divine nature presented by the odor varies. That it is a personal trait of a god, just as all men have an odor of their own, is a primitive idea. It is then simply a distinctive aroma.[13] This leads to the view that it is due to an anointing like the anointing of men with perfume. But of course the divine perfumes are unique, ambrosia and nectar, and of surpassing sweetness. By a natural suggestion or confusion the fragrant offering to the gods by men, whether of incense or of ointment or of oil, is regarded as commuted into the divine aroma.

The odor is a particularly satisfactory symbol for a god because of its real but refined sensory character. It is less tangible than hearing, as hearing is less tangible than seeing.[14] And while all three of these senses often share in the theophany, the coming and the going of the goddess, the margins of her visibility, are to be detected by smell rather than by sight.

[11] Plutarch, *De defectu orac.* 21, p. 421 B.

[12] Homeric Hymn to Demeter 231, 277 f. The same expressions occur in the gnostic *Acts of Thomas* 6. Satire and comedy, of course, follow suit, e. g. Aristophanes, *Pax* 525 f.; Lucian, *Ver. hist.* II. 5.

[13] At the first approach of the chorus of the Oceanids Aeschylus's Prometheus asks (lines 115 f.):

τίς ἀχώ, τίς ὀδμὰ προσέπτα μ' ἀφεγγής,
θεόσυτος, ἢ βρότειος, ἢ κεκραμένη;

[14] There is conventional order of climax in Paul's question (1 Cor. 12 17): *εἰ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ὀφθαλμός, ποῦ ἡ ἀκοή; εἰ ὅλον ἀκοή, ποῦ ἡ ὄσφρησις;*

Again quite recently the superior subtlety of the olfactory sense is being recognized. I quote one example. "Smell especially, perhaps the most atrophied of all the senses of man, shows signs of having once been in the main a time-dealing sense; everybody is familiar with its power in reviving the memory of the past; and I have heard a rumour of certain speculations in Germany to the effect that the human mind has missed a vast amount of interesting knowledge by trusting to sight rather than to smell as a means of finding its way through the universe." – L. P. Jacks, *Constructive Citizenship* (1928), p. 13.

Beauty, strength, moral character[15] may be suggested by the divine fragrance, and any of these may be thought of as transferred to man from god. In cases of such transfer the man is anointed or sprinkled.[16]

The immortality of the god is a natural aspect to indicate by smell. And this in turn converges with the odors of flowers that the pagans thought of as blossoming upon the graves of the departed and supplying for them the only life after death which men could know. Even some gods or heroes survived only like Narcissus in the fragrant flower. The odor of immortality converges, too, with the odors of flowers which in Greek and Latin literature mark the islands of the blest. And perhaps there is confusion between the odors of ointments or spices used for embalming the dead and the life of the dead.

The non-material character of deity in Jewish and Christian thought in some respects made the odor of deity less common there than in paganism. Neither the Old Testament nor the New signalizes the divine being's presence by odor. One who is not in either the earthquake or the fire will scarcely be touched with the hand or sensed with the nostril. But in various forms some of the motifs in other religions recur, partly no doubt due to these earlier cultures, though it is never easy to trace them to their source.

References to the fragrance of trees and flowers would be natural in any religion, but when they are used of the garden of Eden at creation or of the paradise that the saints are to enjoy hereafter, one may suspect that Jews and Christians have borrowed from pagan eschatology. The Book of Enoch, as we should expect, refers to such odors from the trees of the garden of Righteousness, or the trees that encircle God's throne, or the trees of life or of knowledge.[17] The summary of the story of creation in 2 Esdras

[15] In the Persian texts the fragrance of Ahriman is a fixed metaphor for morality, and a like fragrance has become an allegory for the living moral forces in man not only in Persian but in Mohammedan religion. Lohmeyer, pp. 22ff.

[16] Lohmeyer, pp. 12ff.

[17] Enoch 24 3ff.; 29 2; 30 2; 31 3; 32 1, 3, 4, all preserved in Greek.

mentions as created on the third day (5 44) fruit and flowers for taste and smell. As early as the Apocalypse of Peter we have like expressions in Christian writings.[18]

The terms of the fragrant garden appear also in more mystical or moral forms in the literature. For the former the Eleventh Ode of Solomon may be quoted:

> I became like the land which blossoms and rejoices in its fruits.
> And the Lord (was) like the sun (shining) upon the face of the land;
> My eyes were enlightened, and my face received the dew:
> And my nostrils had the pleasure of the pleasant odour of the Lord.
> And He carried me into His Paradise
> Where is the abundance of the pleasure of the Lord.[19]

For the apocalyptic writers, somewhat as in the Persian religion,[20] righteousness was the real meaning of flowers and their fragrance.[21] By allegorical use of the Song of Songs the metaphors of fragrance received reinforcement.[22]

Another influence leading to prominence of odor concepts in Jewish and Christian circles was sacrifice. While animal sacrifice was common in ancient religions, and while the odor caused by burning was thought of as affecting the gods as early as in the famous sacrifice following the Assyrian flood story,

> The gods inhaled the odor
> The gods inhaled the sweet odor
> The gods gathered like flies above the sacrifice,[23]

the common Old Testament term, רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ, 'the soothing odor,' which occurs in the parallel account in Genesis 8 21, and elsewhere

[18] *Rev. Petri*, § 5. For Methodius of Olympus and later Christian references to the odors of paradise, see Lohmeyer, *op. cit.* pp. 44ff.

[19] R. Harris and A. Mingana, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon* (1920), Vol. II, pp. 266f.

[20] E. g. *Sacred Books of the East* XXIII, pp. 315, 343; XXIV, p. 30. A full list of Jewish and Christian references to "die himmlischen Wohlgerüche" is given in E. Bölken, *Die Verwandtschaft der Jüdisch-Christlichen mit der Parsischen Eschatologie* (1902), pp. 65–68.

[21] *Apoc. Bar.* 67, 6 = vi. 15, 6b Violet; cf. the Greek *Baruch Apocalypse* 12.

[22] References in Lohmeyer, *loc. cit.*, p. 41, *note* 4.

[23] *Gilgamesh Epic*, Tablet XI, lines 160–162.

as a fixed term,[24] doubtless kept alive in Judaism the connection of sacrifice with the sense of smell. Even more is this true of the Greek translation *ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας* (whence also the English 'sweet savor') where both words of the formula refer to the olfactory sense. It is the technical term in the LXX and in other Jewish Greek, and it is used metaphorically when moral equivalents for burnt sacrifices are referred to. Thus the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* says that the angels of the presence of the Lord offer to the Lord 'a reasonable sweet savor and a bloodless offering,'[25] and the Pauline letters use *ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας* of the gift of the Philippians conveyed by Epaphroditus (Phil. 4 18) or of the offering of Christ in death (Eph. 5 2). The use of *θυσία* or *προσφορά* connects these passages plainly with the sacrificial *terminus technicus*. Probably the same connection exists in 2 Corinthians 2 14ff. where Paul says: "Thanks be unto God, who always leadeth us in triumph in Christ and maketh manifest through us the savor (*τὴν ὀσμήν*) of his knowledge in every place. For we are a sweet savor (*εὐωδία*) of Christ unto God in them that are saved, and in them that perish; to the one a savor (*ὀσμή*) from death unto death; to the other a savor (*ὀσμή*) from life unto life." The Greek terms are here, but the remarkably similar expression in Rabbinic sources about the law as both a balm of life to the obedient and a balm of death to the disobedient,[26] indicates that other fields of ideas have influenced Paul's expression here.

Above all, the incense offerings of Judaism emphasized the

[24] The other instances are mostly assigned to the law code of P. Cf. 1 Sam. 26 19: "If it be Yahweh that hath stirred thee up against me, let him smell an offering." Lev. 26 31 (H): 'I will not smell your soothing odors.' See the interesting discussion of the meaning conveyed by the term in G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the O.T.: its Theory and Practice* (1925), pp. 76ff., 82ff.

[25] Levi 3 6: *ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας λογικὴν καὶ ἀναίμακτον προσφοράν*. Cf. Paul, Rom. 12 1: *θυσίαν ζῶσαν . . . τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν*; Athenagoras *Supplicatio* 13 2: *ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν* [*καὶ*] *τὴν λογικὴν προσάγειν λατρείαν*.

[26] Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T.*, vol. III (1926), *ad loc.*

odor both of the literal cultus and of its metaphorical application. Not unknown to other religions, like the Egyptian, and the Greek, and the Roman,[27] it held a place of increasing importance in the developed Jewish ritual. Certain passages in Ecclesiasticus seem to reflect this aspect, though not without the admixture of the odors of trees and flowers as living in gardens[28] and their aromatic products as used in ointment and perfume.[29] When the incense offerings like the sacrifices are spiritualized they become 'the prayers of the saints.'[30] And the Christian apologists, in their usual depreciation of all, even the Jewish, ritual, assert that God is in no need of such things, "blood or the sweet savor from flowers or incense, being himself the perfect sweet savor without need and without lack,"[31] "for he is always full of all good things, having in himself all sweet savor (i. e. ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας) and all exhalations of fragrant things."[32] In such language non-pagan writers seem to approach the quite anthropomorphic pagan view of an odor of deity. Probably it is here merely the passing figure of a bold polemic. But from other angles also Jewish and Christian writers come near attributing odor to deity itself.

It is of course clear that the smoke or incense that fills the shrine is due to human initiative, but an easy step of imagination

[27] See the excellent article "Rauchopfer" containing much material relevant to our discussion, by E. Pfister in Pauly-Wissowa, Band IA (1914), coll. 267ff.

[28] The association of paradisiacal fragrance with the odors of sacrifice occurs also in Egyptian literature (incense) and probably in Greek, e. g. Pindar, *fragm.* 95 Boeckh = 106, 107 Bergk.

[29] Sir. 24 15; 39 13f. Greek; neither passage yet discovered in Hebrew. The first is throughout a simile of Wisdom, giving forth odors, which among others are like the fume of frankincense in the tabernacle (ὡς λιβάνου ἀτμὶς ἐν σκηνῇ). The combination of temple incense and of fragrant trees was in the second passage and doubtless elsewhere facilitated by the identity in Greek and the similarity in Hebrew of the words for frankincense and Mount Lebanon.

[30] Rev. 5 8; 8 3, 4. Cf. Psalm 140 2: κατευθυνθήτω ἡ προσευχή μου ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιόν σου.

[31] Athenagoras, *Supplicatio* 13 1.

[32] Irenaeus, *Adv. haeres.* IV. 14, 3.

could attribute it to God himself.[33] The cloud at least is a sign of his presence, in the ark or in the temple. Could Yahweh not claim also the smoke of altar or table of incense? A striking passage in Josephus[34] seems to say so. When Solomon dedicated the temple and perfumed it with an infinite quantity of incense, "all the air round about was filled and the sweetness reached even those who happened to be farthest away and made known the arrival of God and his establishment in the place newly built and consecrated to him."

From a much more philosophic angle the gnostic and other early Christian speculation attained the concept of divine odor, though here we may suspect the reëmergence of primitive Gentile conceptions. In theosophical speculation the quality of divinity required some kind of pervasive metaphor, whether in distinction from matter or as a common characteristic of the several divine persons. For the former may be cited the repeated description in Hippolytus of the Sethians who bridged their dualism of light and darkness by the third element, the spirit. But the spirit is not like "a current of wind or a certain gentle breeze which may be felt, but just as if some fragrance (ὀσμή) of ointment or incense made out of a refined mixture,—a power diffusing itself by some impulse of fragrance which is inconceivable and superior to what one can express . . . And the fragrance of the spirit (ἡ εὐωδία τοῦ πνεύματος) is wafted onwards (φέρεται), occupying an intermediate position, and proceeds forth, just as is diffused (φέρεται) the odour of incense offerings (laid) in fire."[35] For the

[33] Cf. above p. 242. Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 80, explains the LXX ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας similarly: "the sweet smell of the sacrifice is not regarded as placating the anger of God at sin, but as a symbol of the pleasure of God in the due discharge of his service—a view which is represented by the paraphrase of the Targum which renders 'an offering which is received with pleasure before God.' Cf. Theod. ὀσμὴ εὐαρεστήσεως."

[34] *Antiquities* VIII. 4, 1, § 101, 102.

[35] Hippolytus, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, X, 11, 1–3 (edit. Wendland, p. 270); v. 19, 3f. (p. 116f.) is almost verbatim the same. I quote the English translation of MacMahon from *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Buffalo (1886), Vol. V, p. 142.

latter we may refer to Basilides as described by the same opponent. I quote, without attempting to explain, one sample: 'Sonship' left the spirit "not altogether deserted or separated from the Sonship; nay, (far from it,) for it is just as when a most fragrant ointment is put into a vessel, that even though the vessel be emptied of it with ever so much care, nevertheless some odour of the ointment still remains, and is left behind even after the ointment is separated from the vessel; and the vessel retains an odour of ointment, though it contain not the ointment itself. So the Holy Spirit has continued without any share in the Sonship, and separated from it, and has in itself, similarly with ointment, its own power, a savour of Sonship. And this is what has been declared: 'As the ointment upon the head which descended to the beard of Aaron.' This is the savour from the Holy Spirit borne down from above, etc."[36]

In both instances, it should be noted, the fragrance is of the Spirit. This brings us back towards the odor at Pentecost. But the idea is not the exclusive property of the heretics. The Mandaean religion, which offers so many points of interesting comparison for New Testament problems, is one of the most profuse of the heresies in its use of odors in connection with divine beings. Since, however, the Spirit is for the Mandaeans not good but maleficent probably it has no fragrance in their records. Among orthodox writers the odor of the spirit occurs primarily[37] in two connections—at baptism and at martyrdom. The latter is familiarly known as the 'odor of sanctity' and is still a subject of belief in the Roman Catholic church. But it has a long ancestry.[38] Early occurrences

[36] *Ibid.*, VII, 22, 13ff. (edit. Wendland, p. 199f.): Eng. trans. VII, 10, 105.

[37] One instance in Eusebius, though mentioned at the time of martyrdom, seems to be a general description of the life of Julian of Cappadocia, who is described as πνέων αὐτοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (*De martyr. Palaest.* XI, 27, ed. Schwartz, p. 945). The longer Greek form (also original) reads πνέων εὐωδίας ἁγίου πνεύματος and similarly the Syriac *History of the Martyrs of Palestine* (ed. and trans. by W. Cureton, London (1861), p. 44).

[38] E. A. Stückelberg, "Der Geruch der Heiligkeit," *Schweizer Archiv für Volkskunde,* XXII (1919), pp. 203ff. (cited by Lohmeyer).

are the martyrdoms by fire quoted by Eusebius,—that of Polycarp,[39] and that of the martyrs at Lyons.[40] The full history of the conception we need not here consider. No doubt the use of spices at burial played some part in the idea.[41] Then God himself supernaturally bestows the same preservative that human ministrations normally supply. Another line of filiation may go back to the pre-Christian notions of the odors that mark survival of death. The saints are immortal and their immortality is conveyed to the nostrils of their friends at death or even earlier. Something of both notions is found in the saying of Ignatius that "the Lord received ointment upon his head, that he might breathe forth immortality to his church."[42]

Baptism in Christianity lays stress on the Holy Spirit. But it also goes back to the use of fragrant oil. It is a chrism, and the odors of its ancestry are revived in the Christian idea of anointing

[39] *H. E.* IV., 15, 37 (ed. Schwartz, *Griech. christl. Schriftst.* IX, p. 348): *καὶ γὰρ εὐωδίας τοσαύτης ἀντελαβόμεθα, ὡς λιβανωτοῦ πνέοντος ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς τῶν τιμίων ἀρωμάτων,* also extant separately in Greek and Latin MSS. = *Mart. Polyc.* 15. Fifty years ago Harnack made this passage the basis of an illuminating discussion of the origin and meaning of the odor of Christ in the saints (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, II (1878), pp. 291–296). He connects it partly with the idea of the death of the martyr as an atoning sacrifice like the Old Testament *ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας*, partly with the idea of immortality.

[40] *H. E.* V, 1, 35 (*ibid.*, p. 416): *τὴν εὐωδίαν ὀδωδότες ἅμα τὴν χριστοῦ, ὥστε ἐνίους δόξαι καὶ μύρῳ κοσμικῷ κεχρῖσθαι αὐτούς.*

[41] See the passage just quoted. It does not seem to me likely that Lucian in *Peregrin. Proteus* 36 is parodying the Christian idea. He represents Proteus as scattering incense on the blazing pyre before he himself leaped into the flames. Attention may however be called to the Gospel stories of the anointing of Jesus not only after but before the crucifixion, Matt. 62 12 = Mark. 14 8 = John 12 7 and esp. vs. 3: *ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μύρου.* As with the incense at the temple, the offerings of man merge into the sensible expression of deity.

[42] *Eph.* XVII, 1: *ἵνα πνέῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀφθαρσίαν.* The context and contrast (*δυσωδίαν τῆς διδασκαλίας τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*) shows that the language is figurative. Ignatius does not need to explain to his readers the equivalence of ointment to immortality any more than he does the Pauline metaphor of the church as the head of Christ.

with the spirit. Indeed, before long the literal physical odors were applied, and besides water, ointment came into use.[43] Of course baptism as well as martyrdom was an earnest of immortality. And so Cyril of Jerusalem could address catechumens with the words: *ἤδη μακαριότητος ὀσμὴ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὦ φωτιζόμενοι· ἤδη τὰ νοητὰ ἄνθη συλλέγετε πρὸς πλοκὴν ἐπουρανίων στεφάνων· ἤδη τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ἔπνευσεν ἡ εὐωδία.*[44]

Of the part played in medieval Christianity by the symbolism of odors I must not now speak.[45] Let us return to the story of Pentecost and see what suggestions our long digressions into wide fields of religious history have brought us.

It may be observed in the first place that our various texts, at least those in Greek, confirm the view that the wording of our Greek Acts readily lent itself to interpretation as "a strong odor was wafted abroad and it filled the whole house where they were sitting." Whenever the subject of odors appears in Greek

[43] On the separate sacrament of unction and the significance attached to the odors of the oil by the early gnostics see Lohmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 41 *note* 2, and the very full treatment of "Ölsakrament" in W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (1907), pp. 297–305. The oil is oil of the tree of life. It gives to believers the heavenly odor that keeps demons away. The Clementine *Recognitions* I, 45 speak of its intended effect upon believers *ut et ipsorum lux luceat et spiritu sancto repleti immortalitate donentur*. The Marcosians called it *τύπον τῆς ὑπὲρ τὰ ὅλα εὐωδίας* (Irenaeus, I, 21, 5).

There is also some evidence of a use of incense at baptism in Moses bar Kepha. See R. A. Aytoun in *Expositor*, Oct. 1911, p. 343.

[44] Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 33, 322.

[45] There are numerous references to odors in mystic experiences in the records of the Dominican nuns in Switzerland, in Jacob Boehme, George Fox, etc. See for example: H. Wilms, *Das Beten der Mystikerinnen* (1916), pp. 148f.; Rufus M. Jones, *Spiritual Reformers of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (1914), p. 223. I content myself with one brief quotation from *The Book of Divine Consolation of the Blessed Angela of Foligno*: translated from the Italian by Mary G. Steegmann (London 1909), p. 168. After her first vision of the Lord she says: "From this time forth I was often aware of indescribable odours: but these and other things can I not explain, so great was the sweetness and joy which I did feel in them." Reference may also be made to a short statement by the present writer in *The Friend* (London), Vol. LXVIII (1928), pp. 604ff., on "Creation's Other Smell".

writing, then the verb πνέω is used naturally and easily. I limit my examples to odors connected with religion. Even to his invented goddess, Theoria, Aristophanes cries

> οἷον δὲ πνεῖς, ὡς ἡδὺ κατὰ τῆς καρδίας,
> γλυκύτατον, ὥσπερ ἀστρατείας καὶ μύρου.[46]

The mouth of the oracle 'breathes forth' most sweetly, [47] so does the body of Alexander.[48] The bathing place of the bride Hera still 'breathes up' a fragrance.[49] Of the home of the blest we read that it 'breathes out' a soft and gentle aura,[50] or that a certain wonderful aura 'breathes about' those who approach it, sweet and fragrant, such as the historian Herodotus says blows from Araby the blest.[51] The trees which Enoch saw 'breathe' of the spices frankincense and myrrh.[52] When deity confers grace or beauty or health on mortals the same verb is used.[53] When Christ is anointed with ointment it is that he may 'breathe' forth incorruption on the church.[54] And at the martyrdom of Polycarp the witness felt as though frankincense or some other of the precious spices was 'breathing' forth.[55]

The noun πνοή or πνοίη appears, though less frequently, in the same connections. Lucian in his *De dea Syra* 30 speaks of

[46] Aristophanes, *Pax* 525f.

[47] Plutarch, *De defectu orac.* 21, p. 421B: ἥδιστον ἀποπνέοντος.

[48] Plutarch, *vit. Alex.* 4: τοῦ χρωτὸς ἥδιστον ἀπέπνει. See the whole discussion of the origin of Alexander's fragrance.

[49] Aelian, *Nat. animal.* 12, 30 ἐς νῦν ὁ χῶρος εὐωδίαν ἀναπνεῖ.

[50] Plutarch, *De sera num. vind.* 22, p. 565F: ἐξέπνει δὲ μαλακὴν καὶ πραείαν αὖραν ὀσμὰς ἀναφέρουσαν ἡδονῆς τε θαυμασίας καὶ κρᾶσιν.

[51] Lucian, *Ver. hist.* 11, 5: θαυμαστή τις αὖρα περιέπνευσεν ἡμᾶς, ἡδεῖα καὶ εὐώδης κτλ.

[52] Enoch, Greek Trans., 29, 2: δένδρα πνέοντα ἀρωμάτων.

[53] Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* 238: ἡδὺ καταπνείουσα. *Hymn. orph.* 84, 8: ὄλβον ἐπιπνείουσα καὶ ἠπιόχειρον ὑγιείαν. (Hymn to Hestia, cited by Lohmeyer p. 14).

[54] Ignatius, *Eph.* XVII, 1. For πνέω ἀφθαρσίαν cf. Irenaeus III, 11, 8 (speaking of the gospels): πανταχόθεν πνέοντας τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν. Cf. references in note 56.

[55] Eus., *loc. cit.* in note 39.

the ambrosial odor that greets from afar one that approaches the temple with its good breath (πνοίην), a breath that clings to the garments as one departs. For Irenaeus ὀδμὴ ἀφθαρσίας and πνοὴ ἀφθαρσίας are interchangeable.[56] For the Spirit (πνεῦμα)[57] certainly the cognate πνέω and πνοή might well have seemed to an ancient writer appropriate.[58]

Of the verb φέρεσθαι also our examination of divine odors in Greek sources has given some examples. Hippolytus at least uses it repeatedly in his description of the odors, whether of the Spirit or of incense, in the systems of Basilides or the Sethians.[59] We have already quoted from the *Revelatio Petri* 5 τοσοῦτον δὲ ἦν τὸ ἄνθος ὡς καὶ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖθεν φέρεσθαι.

Characteristic, too, of references to smell,—more characteristic than of references to sounds, as it is usually taken,—is the phrase in Acts 2 3, that it 'filled all the house.' Beside John 12 3, 'the house was filled with the odor of the ointment,' could be cited passages from Egyptian inscriptions as, '(the palace) was overflowed with the odor of the god,'[60] and from elsewhere.

The association of smell with the other two senses of sight and sound, as emphasized by Ephrem in the account of Pentecost, also occurs in other sources, indeed occurs so often of epiphanies that Lohmeyer can say: "Daraus wird die Einfügung des Wohlgeruches 'begreiflich'."[61] His examples are partly Greek and

[56] Iren. I, 4, 1 and I, 6, 1. So ἐκπνοή Eur. *Hipp.* 1438.

[57] Note the use of πνεῦμα itself nearly in this sense in Euripides' *Hipp.* 1391.

[58] And since the spirit is thought of as inspiring the prophets, Origen (*Philocalia*, ed. J. A. Robinson, p. 34) and Eusebius (*Dem. Evan. VIII. Proem.* 11; *G. C. S.* XXIII, p. 351 ed. Heikel) speak of the odor that breathes from the prophecies. So Hippolytus, *Comm. in Cant.* ed. Bonwetsch I, 366 calls τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον of 2 Pet. 1 19 'the fragrant word.'

[59] *Refutatio*, ed. P. Wendland, pp. 117, 7, 8; 200, 6; 270, 18, 19.

[60] Inscription on wall of temple at Deir-el-Bahari, cited by Lohmeyer, *loc. cit.*, p. 15 from Naville.

[61] *Op. cit.*, p. 43, *note* 4. Harnack, *loc. cit.*, p. 295f. *note*, knew of the tradition of an odor at Pentecost from Lagarde's miscalled διδαχὴ Ἀδδαίου and makes this comment: "Man hat also in späterer Zeit den ἦχος ὥσπερ

partly Egyptian, and he finds echoes of this tripartite division for the former in Paul (1 Cor. 12 17): *εἰ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ὀφθαλμός, ποῦ ἡ ἀκοή; εἰ ὅλον ἀκοή, ποῦ ἡ ὄσφρησις*;[62] for the latter in a record of Memphitic theology which says "If the eyes see, the ears hear, the nose breathes the air, only so they bring it to the heart."[63] Evidently in several cultures popular psychology required the witness of three senses for the perception of deity.[64]

But aside from all verbal suggestions in the text, the odor at Pentecost has doubtless some connection with the widespread symbolism of odors in religion to which we have referred. If, as is possible, it appeared first or exclusively in the Syriac church it might be attributed to certain eastern cultural contacts. But which line of descent represents its real ancestry is uncertain. It would seem to be the old or revived motif of the mark of an epiphany and to serve the usual purpose of facilitating human recognition of the divine presence. The notion of anointing, with its connotations of fragrance, may also be responsible for it here.

It is not impossible that it owes its origin in part to Ephrem himself. There are appearances of the idea in Syriac sources of later date. In fact the following two passages were mentioned in a brief note by Eb. Nestle[65] in 1903 without his knowing anything of the evidence from Ephrem Syrus on Acts although this had been published previously by Rendel Harris. The passages are as follows:

> The *Doctrine of Addai*, (or the *Doctrine of the Apostles*): And when Simon Cephas had spoken these things to his fellow Apostles, and

φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας, welcher das ganze Haus erfüllte, in eine *ὀσμὴ ἡδεία* umdeuten zu müssen gemeint. So notwendig erschien bereits der 'Wohlgeruch' als begleitendes Zeichen einer überirdischen Manifestation."

[62] *Op. cit.*, p. 5, *note* 1.

[63] *Op. cit.*, p. 15 *note* 2, quoting from Erman, "Ein Denkmal memphitischer Theologie," *Sitzungsberichte d. Berl. Akad.*, phil.-hist. Klasse XLIII (1911), p. 939. For a Christian use of the triad see Origen, *Philocalia*, ed. J. A. Robinson (Cambridge, 1803), p. 34.

[64] There are many cases also of light and odor without sound.

[65] *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* IV, 272f., cf. VII (1906), 95.

reminded them, a voice of mystery was heard by them and a sweet odour which is strange to the world was diffused on them, and tongues of fire, between the voice and the odour, came down to them from heaven, and alighted and sat upon every one of them, and according to the tongue which each of them had received he prepared himself to go to that country in which that tongue was spoken.[66]

The Book of the Bee by Salomon of Basra: At the third hour of the holy Sunday of Pentecost, a mighty sound was heard, so that all men were terrified and marvelled at the mightiness of the sound; and the chamber was filled with an ineffably strong light. And there appeared over the head of each one of them (something) in the form of tongues of fire, and there breathed forth from thence a sweet odour which surpassed all aromas in the world.[67]

Further reasons for attributing the reading to Ephrem or at least to the tradition of the Syriac Church occur in some other

[66] English translation from the *Doctrine of the Apostles* in W. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents* (London 1864), p. 25. The Syriac text is given *ibid.*, p. ܦܗ. The basis was two British Museum MSS. and the following named edition. A. P. Lagarde, *Reliquiae iuris ecclesiastici antiquissimae*, XIII, (Leipzig—printed in Vienna—1856), p. 90 gives his own Greek translation of the same passage. This is quoted by Nestle, *loc. cit.*, and others as doctrine of Addai because the heading of the whole and sub-heading of this first part were given as ἡ διδαχή Ἀδδαίου.

[67] English translation from *The Book of the Bee*, edited by Ernest A. Wallis Budge, (*Anecdota Oxoniensa*, Semitic Series, Vol. I. Part. II). Oxford, 1886, Chap. 47, p. 103; Syriac text, p. ܩܢܗ. A Latin translation of Syriac and Arabic text in J. M. Schoenfelder *Salomonis episcopi Bassorensis liber apis* (Bamberg, 1866), p. 76. The author's *floruit* was about 1222 A. D.

As another Syriac writer continuing the traditional exegetical tradition after Ephrem of the odor at Pentecost perhaps we may add Isho'dad of Merv who lived about 850 A.D. In his commentary on this pericope of Acts according to the English translation of Mrs. M. D. Gibson (*Horae Semiticae* X (1913), p. 7) he said: "Suddenly the sound of heavy thunder came and from the force of the sound, the inhabitants of Jerusalem were terrified, and there was seen above that upper room fire that was formed in the likeness of a burning ball; and a vapour of smoke and a soft wind blowing in the midst of the upper room and around it; and from that ardent flame there were distributed gifts in the form of tongues of fire." But in the original Syriac (p. 10*) the adjective here translated 'soft' is ܒܣܝܡܐ which can hardly stand for *βιαίας*, but primarily and perhaps more commonly means 'sweet' or 'fragrant.' This passage illustrates how easily in the process of translation an odor can appear or can vanish from the text.

passages which, so far as I know, have not been cited in this connection. The important work, the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, at least in the form in which Ephrem commented on it, contained at the baptism of Jesus beside the voice from heaven, not only the light at Jordan, which reminds us of Justin Martyr, but also perhaps a statement that the odor of perfumes was wafted. Thus the familiar process of conforming the baptism of Jesus and Christian baptism has led to the recurrence of the same triple evidences of the senses at the Jordan as at Pentecost. The passage as quoted and translated from the commentary of Isho'dad of Merv on Matthew 3 15—17 by Mrs. Lewis reads:

> And straightway, as the Diatessaron testifies, a great light shone, and the Jordan was surrounded by white clouds, and the Jordan stood still quietly from its course, its waters not being troubled and a scent of perfumes was wafted thence.[68]

Still further the harmonization of similar scenes carried the harmonist Tatian or his commentator Ephrem. The transfiguration scene is notoriously like the baptism scene, and Ephrem's comment reads, in the Latin translation of the Armenian:

> Quum Moyses et Elias apparuisset, dixit Simon: *Si vis, Domine, faciamus hic tria tabernacula.* Quod dixit, quia illum montem a vexationibus Scribarum vacuum et quietum vidit et hoc ei placuit. Fragrans in nares eius suavis odor regni pervenit et deliciis eum affecit.[69]

[68] *Horae Semiticae* V (Cambridge, 1911), p. 27. (Syriac text, *ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. 46). The marginal reference is to Gannat Busanne, p. 55. The same passage had been detected as Ephrem's and quoted in a slightly different wording in 1895 by J. R. Harris, *Fragments of the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus upon the Diatessaron* (1895), p. 43, and simultaneously by H. Goussen, *Studia Theologica*, fasc. I. "Pauca fragmenta genuina diatessaronica," p. 63.

The odor may be Isho'dad's or Tatian's rather than Ephrem's. The Armenian translation of Ephrem's commentary (Mösinger, p. 43; see note 69) has the light and the voice at baptism but not the odor.

[69] The translation is that of J. B. Aucher emended by G. Mösinger *Evangelii concordantis expositio facta a sancto Ephraemo doctore Syro* (Venice, 1876), p. 156. It is strange that Rendel Harris, though he quotes all other parts of this passage in his *Fragments of the Commentary of Ephrem Syrus*

Finally I may mention two further instances of an odor of the spirit in Syriac writers, for both of which I am indebted to my friend, Dr. C. H. Kraeling. One is from Ephrem again, but this time on still earlier analogies for Pentecost, the anointing of Saul and David:

> In unctione Saulis regis, quanto suavior fuit odor olei tanto gravior fuit odor cordis . . . In unctione Davidis, fratres, descendit Spiritus in cor eius et grato implevit odore. Qualis olei talis cordis suavitas. Habitavit in eo spiritus psalmosque dictavit.[70]

The other is from Ephrem's predecessor, Aphraates, in a less definite context,—a comment on Isaiah 41 17—19, with a reference to 2 Cor. 2 14. The Latin column reads:

> De infimis hominibus egressum est verbum et doctrina Spiritus, cuius fragrantia ut cupressi pulcherrimi suavis est.[71]

I cannot suppose I have said the last word on the odor of the Spirit at Pentecost. My object has been to state the problem and to get thereby the advice and help of my colleagues. I hope that they will follow the scent—if I may use the figure—and let us know what solution for the question seems the best, or even what further materials for its solution come to their attention.

upon the Diatessaron (1895), p. 63, and all the preceding passage on p. 43, neither there nor in the earlier work in which the odor at Pentecost is referred to (see note 4) calls attention to the parallelism between the three passages. The connection did not escape the late H. Goussen as his interesting notes (*loc. cit.*) testify.

[70] T. J. Lamy, *Sancti Ephraem Syri hymni et sermones*, Hymni in Festum Epiphaniae III, 16 (*Opera* Vol. I. Mechlin, 1882), col. 35, 36, Stanzas 15, 16. Cf. Stanza 21. The *unctio externa* and *interna* of Christian baptismal ordinals are under discussion.

[71] Aphraates, *Demonstratio* XX, 14, in *Patrologia Syriaca* Part. I, Vol. I, edit. by R. Graffin (Paris, 1894), col. 915f.

DOES PAUL CLAIM TO HAVE KNOWN THE HISTORICAL JESUS?

A STUDY OF 2 CORINTHIANS 5 16

FRANK C. PORTER
YALE UNIVERSITY

THE most emphatic affirmative answer to this question is that given by Johannes Weiss in his *Paulus und Jesus*, 1909, pp. 23–31 (English Trans. pp. 41–56) and his *Das Urchristentum* pp. 137 ff. and 347 ff. If Weiss had lived, his interpretation of this verse would have had its final elaboration and a conspicuous place in his Meyer commentary on 2 Corinthians. He begins his discussion in *Paulus und Jesus* with an assertion which, if it is true, is of such great importance in its bearing on the whole problem of the relation of Paul's Christianity to the person and the religion of Jesus that it deserves the most careful consideration. He says, "The wholly arbitrary assumption of theology that Paul had not known Jesus in his lifetime is finally excluded by the express statement of the Apostle himself in 2 Cor. 5 16." And at the end of his defence of this position, after acknowledging that the text is abrupt and obscure, he insists that "the words as they stand admit no other interpretation than .... that Paul had seen and known Jesus in person;" but he adds, "and that he himself designates this as a knowledge *κατὰ σάρκα*, on which he now puts no value, since it is superseded by a better knowledge, *κατὰ πνεῦμα*. Paul only refers to the point because his opponents boasted of such knowledge on their own part." Weiss's argument involves understanding *ἡμεῖς* as an emphatic "I," since while verses 14–15

and 17 apply to all Christians, v. 16, so understood describes his own personal experience. The words κατὰ σάρκα, in accordance with their position, Weiss construes not with the objects (so as to mean "no one according to his external human characteristics" and "Christ in his human earthly nature"), but with the verbs, so as to characterize a kind of knowledge. It is a knowledge which can end at a certain point of time, and is therefore a matter of will, rather than of memory or information. It must mean a renunciation of former human relationships, or a decision that something formerly known has no longer any value. In fact Weiss applies the first of these alternatives to 16a, and the second to 16b, thus seriously impairing the parallelism of the two halves of the verse. The moment of time is that of conversion, the change from old to new indicated in verses 14, 15 and 17. Accordingly v. 16a means that Paul's conversion brought to an end the natural human relationships in which he had stood to home, family and nation. It was for him a tragic severing of ties. But 16b means that Paul had known Christ as men know one another, that is, had seen him with his eyes, but that now such knowledge was valueless to him. The words, "from now on no one do we know" had tragical significance for Paul in 16a, says Weiss, but the parallel expression in 16b must mean no loss, but only gain. Weiss seems to recognize that this gives a different meaning to "knowing according to flesh" in the two parallel halves of the verse; and he suggests another possibility, namely, that 16a is aimed against the claim of his opponents to have a personal acquaintance with such men as Peter and James, as 16b is aimed against their claim to have seen Jesus. Then, in 16a, Paul would say that he also knew such men, but put no value on such knowledge. This is surely an unjustifiable limitation of οὐδένα. But there is a more serious difficulty with Weiss's position. He believes, correctly I would say, that Paul had a vivid and true impression of the personality of the historical Jesus. Weiss thinks that Paul's actual seeing of Jesus is essential as an explanation of his vision, his recognition of the heavenly Messiah as Jesus. But also the deeply personal nature of Paul's attitude toward Jesus

throughout, and the degree in which his Christianity, especially on the ethical side, was determined by the actual character and teachings of Jesus, require the supposition that he had received a definite and powerful impression of Jesus' personality. Weiss, therefore, is glad to find in the verse before us Paul's own definite affirmation that he had seen and known Jesus. But if Paul here claims a knowledge of Jesus which had such fundamental importance for him as Weiss holds that it had, how can Paul say in the same breath that this knowledge has now for him no value, or even that it no longer exists? It is not enough to answer, with Weiss, that the heavenly Lord has taken the place of the earthly Jesus in Paul's religion, for Weiss himself has to acknowledge that it is essential to Paul to affirm that the heavenly Lord is inwardly the same as he who lived on earth and died on the cross. It is his earthly life and death that disclose his nature as love. How could one who wrote Phil. 2 1–11 say that he no longer valued the knowledge he had of Christ in the flesh? Weiss confesses that 5 16b must have been called out in controversy and "does not cover all that he really felt" (*Urchristentum*, p. 137f.). But that the love of Christ is the inspiring motive of all his willing and acting is affirmed in verses 14–15. How could any polemical interest have driven this out of Paul's mind in v. 16, which is introduced as an inference (ὥστε)?

Weiss is right, I believe, where many exponents of Paul are wrong, in his emphasis upon the extent of the influence of the historical Jesus on Paul; but he is, therefore, wrong in supposing that Paul could say, and with such emphasis, that his knowledge of the historical Jesus is a knowledge κατὰ σάρκα, which has now come to an end. He is right in saying that κατὰ σάρκα belongs with the verbs, not with their objects; but, therefore, wrong in thinking still that Paul refers to the earthly in distinction from the heavenly Christ. This distinction of two Christs is exactly the meaning that he has rejected, the common construction of κατὰ σάρκα with Χριστόν, in the sense of "Christ in his human, earthly nature." To know other men, and also Christ, "according to flesh" is, in this verse, a knowing which ceases when one becomes

Christian. It is therefore a wrong, a common human, but an un-Christian, attitude. Only as such can it "from now on" no longer exist. It can be only an attitude toward men which is "according to man," but not "according to Christ." It therefore cannot be a knowing of the historical Jesus; for there is certainly no sin in that. Nor is it possible for any one suddenly to bring that knowledge to an end, even if there were any conceivable reason for wishing and trying to do so. What this knowledge is which belongs to Paul's and to every Christian's past, and ends when their Christianity begins, would seem to be clearly enough suggested by the connection in which the verse stands. It can be only the opposite of being impelled by the love of Christ, of living not to oneself, of being "in Christ" a new creature. And yet this natural understanding is one which I, at least, in my readings among recent commentaries have not found, — the understanding, namely, that to know all men and to know Christ κατὰ σάρκα, is to have toward them the too common human feelings of hatred or fear, of envy, suspicion, ill-will, in one word of selfishness, in contrast to the new feeling toward men, Christ-like, and created by Christ, or by God in Christ, the feeling, or total personal attitude, of love. This is the understanding of the verse which I want to expound and defend in what follows.

It is no doubt true that to our way of thinking the most obvious and the most important distinction between Paul and the earlier apostles is that they had been disciples of Jesus and he had not. We should expect this to be urged against his apostleship by his enemies, and we should expect to find him replying. It is, therefore, tempting to assume that the verse before us has some reference to this subject, but I believe that it has none at all.

For the sake of clearness let me set down at the outset what seem to me to be quite evident marks and tests of a correct understanding of Paul's thought in this verse.

1. The verse has two members and its two halves must be understood as parallel to each other.

2. The first half should have the first place, and the second half should be understood in the light of the first.

3. Κατὰ σάρκα belongs with the verbs, and describes a certain way of knowing men, a way that is human and natural, "as men commonly know men."

4. It is a way of knowing men which ends for those who are "in Christ," for whom a new way takes its place.

5. The "we" need not, and in view of verses 14—15, 17, probably does not, mean Paul alone, but Christians in general; so that 16b does not refer to an experience peculiar to Paul.

Our survey of other recent expositions of the verse must be brief. Few accept Weiss's view, yet few escape some sort of reference to the historical Jesus, that is some connection of κατὰ σάρκα with Χριστόν. Perhaps Meyer's dogmatic affirmation has had influence, namely, that κατὰ σάρκα does not define subjectively the standard of our knowing, but objectively the standard by which men are judged; and that Paul means that for the Christian, because of Christ, the old outward distinctions between men have ceased (see Gal. 3 28). The knowledge of Christ, which Paul had left behind, was, therefore, a knowledge of the external Christ, in his earthly station, work and fate. All this Paul could have known without having seen Jesus with his own eyes, which Meyer thinks is not the meaning of this verse because of the "but now no more."

Windisch, who took Weiss's place in the last rewriting of Meyer's 2 Corinthians, thinks no confident decision can be reached among the six interpretations of 5 16b which he lists. These are, in brief:

1. Χριστόν means not Jesus but Messiah. (Impossible, Windisch says, in view of verses 14 and 17.)

2. Paul refers to himself as a persecutor, when he denied the Messiahship and Sonship of Jesus.

3. Paul refers to a Judaistic stage in his Christianity, and a later second conversion. (Gal. 1 contradicts this. "From now on" can only mean from conversion.)

4. Paul had known Jesus in the flesh. Windisch rejects Weiss's view on the ground that Paul could not in one sentence affirm that he had seen Jesus and so was equal to other apostles, and then cast this knowledge aside as worthless. But in some other

than this literal sense a knowing of the historical Jesus could be meant.

a) What he learned from others might be exaggerated as if equivalent to his having seen Jesus.

b) "We" may be used in a free sense of the whole community.

c) Or, "We" means Paul and his fellow-workers, some of whom could have been disciples of Jesus.

5. Paul's having known Jesus is hypothetical. Even if I had known him in the flesh, he says, I would not now value such knowledge.

6. Paul had learned to know Jesus from tradition.

Of these possibilities Windisch prefers 4b; next to that 4c, or 4a; and he regards as possible 5, 6, and 2.

It is to be noted that none of these apply, as they are stated, to 16a; but the true interpretation of 16b must first truly interpret 16a. My own preference is for No. 2, but only in a form that does not apply to Paul alone as the one who knows, but to all Christians; nor to Christ alone as the one known, but to all men.

We have seen that Weiss approaches the verse with the interest of finding in it Paul's own testimony to the fact that he had seen Jesus and come directly under his personal influence. And we have seen the weakness of Weiss's position in the fact that he insists on finding Paul's testimony to this personal contact with Jesus, although he has to take with it Paul's judgment that it is now to him without value. A different approach is that of Reitzenstein, whose exposition of our verse in his *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (unchanged in the successive editions) is of importance. This is the approach of one who is looking for the influence upon Paul of Hellenistic cults, and finds that influence in the independence and immediateness of the knowledge which Paul here claims for himself. Paul needs no knowledge of Christ of the sort that depends on others' testimony. The verse is to be understood in accordance with Paul's assertion of his independence of "man" in Gal. 1 11–12, 15–17. But Gal. 1–2 is itself the disproof of Weiss's view that Paul affirms that he had seen the earthly Jesus. The knowledge which makes him independent of man came with his vision of the exalted Christ (Gal. 1 15–16), and with

his experience of Christ as indwelling Spirit (Gal. 2 19—20, 4 6—7). Our verse, Reitzenstein rightly says, implies two ways of knowing, one past, the other present; but he unfortunately adds, that while this is enough to say in the case of v. 16a, in v. 16b Paul describes the past knowledge not simply as a human way of knowing Christ, but also as a knowing of the human, earthly Jesus. Having thus admitted a reference to the historical Jesus in v. 16b, that is, having connected *κατὰ σάρκα* with *Χριστόν*, *as well as* with *ἐγνώκαμεν*, he must provide a substitute for Weiss's inference that Paul had seen the historical Jesus, and adopts the view that the first half of v. 16b states an unreal condition (see Windisch's No. 5, and Heinrici's Meyer). The sentence has, then, a concessive conditional sense, and means, not "Though I have known etc.," but "Even if I had known Christ *κατὰ σάρκα* — as I have not — I would now know him so no more." Paul would undo any relation to the earthly Jesus, even if he had had it, because he must be independent of recollections, his own or others', and of everything past, and must know Christ immediately, in a way which he could verify in his own present experience. One who has seen God has an abiding capacity to know him, and to know all things, for himself. We may agree with Reitzenstein's stress on the importance of Paul's consciousness of his independence of man and of everything external in his knowledge of Christ, as we may agree with Weiss's emphasis on the influence of the historical Jesus on Paul's religion, and yet, in this case as in that, we may question whether Paul has that thought in mind in the verse before us. Against Reitzenstein, as against Weiss, stands the objection that his interpretation of v. 16b does not fit 16a. There is certainly no unreal hypothetical character in the former knowing of every man to which v. 16a refers. "We" have really had the knowledge *κατὰ σάρκα* of our fellowmen which we now have no longer. Moreover, because of v. 16a, it is not allowable to make Paul say something about himself which could not be said about every Christian; nor to make him say something about Christ, and the Christian's old and new attitude toward him, which could not be said about all men, and the Chris-

tian's attitude toward them. Paul is describing, not only in v. 16, but throughout vv. 14—17, the great change which has taken place, not in himself only, but in all who are in Christ, and not toward Christ only, but toward all men. Reitzenstein, on the contrary, is obliged to say that Paul here sets himself apart from other Christians, and especially from those who claim to have known the earthly Jesus; that he makes the personal love and attachment of the disciple to Jesus irrelevant, and affirms that the apostle, who has seen the exalted Christ, is thereby set above the disciple, the follower of Jesus himself. The truth of Reitzenstein's understanding of Paul as a πνευματικός requires detailed consideration. Here it is enough to express the conviction that the verse before us does not bear upon this matter at all.

Among other commentators it may be noted that Lietzmann, in his first edition, held the view which Windisch mentions as 4a; but in the second edition he has been persuaded by Reitzenstein to accept the interpretation of v. 16b as stating an unreal hypothesis.

Bousset finds the motive of our verse in Paul's self-defence against those who claim for themselves or for their authorities (Peter, etc.) the advantage of a personal knowledge of Jesus, which Paul did not have. They perhaps also appealed to the example and words of Jesus against Paul as supporting their position as Judaizers in regard to the law. The sentence (v. 16b) is radical and bold, and Bousset says that it can almost be called an act of desperation on Paul's part when he thus breaks off connection with the earthly Jesus and rejects his authority, because he could not himself bear witness to it, and yet must maintain his claim to be an apostle fully equal to any other. He does this, Bousset says, in spite of the fact that he, who had never known Jesus personally, understood his inmost nature better than the small minds who appealed to their personal connection with him. He could with truth have quoted Jesus as on his side in the controversy about Judaism and the law. The knowledge that Paul had of Jesus, according to the flesh, was probably indirect (see Windisch, No. 6), though a passing sight of him in Jerusalem is not impossible.

Bousset's view is open to the objection already made against the views of Weiss and Reitzenstein that v. 16b is interpreted in a sense that does not apply to 16a. Paul could not have written 16a first, and put 16b in parallelism with it, if his purpose had been what Bousset supposes. Is there, indeed, in the form, or tone, or connection of v. 16, and the almost incidental way in which Χριστόν is introduced, the slightest suggestion of this bold and desperate decision, this unnatural breaking off from Jesus and his authority, forced upon Paul in self-defence against his will? The immediate setting (vv. 14—17) is one of the greatest, most confident and exultant of Paul's expressions of the power of Christ to make new men and a new world. Verse 16 must necessarily be one description of that end of the old and beginning of the new which Christ brought about. The old that ends cannot possibly be anything that Paul values, and relinquishes under compulsion and with regret. That which from now on is no more can only be something that belongs among the old things which it is the glory of Christ to have brought to an end.

Let us turn now to our own reading of the verse. It has been remarked by many that v. 16 seems almost like an after-thought. It is introduced as a consequence of vv. 14—15; but in verse 17 is another ὥστε, which connects not with v. 16, but with vv. 14—15, and brings the great thoughts of those verses to a great and fitting climax and conclusion. If verse 16 were not here it would not be missed. This does not mean however, that it is a later gloss (Völter). Just because it would never have occurred to a scribe that something was lacking between v. 15 and v. 17, it is easier to account for v. 16 as an instance of the frequent unexpectedness of Paul's mental operations. Weiss suggests that he might have inserted it after finishing the letter. Its importance would be no less, perhaps rather greater, if that were the case.

The verse consists of two parallel sentences. There can be no doubt that "but now no longer" in the second half corresponds to "from now on" in the first; and that to know according to flesh has the same meaning in both sentences. There must also be a correspondence between οὐδένα and Χριστόν. Something is

said in the first half that applies to every one, and in the second half the same thing is applied to Christ. It is absolutely requisite that the interpretation of either one of the two sentences shall be such as to fit and explain the other. Most of the recent interpreters of the second half seem to feel no duty to provide a parallel interpretation of the first. But still further it is surely fair to claim that in such a parallelism the first half has the right to the first place, and the second half must be understood in the light of the first, and in accordance with it. Paul's first and chief affirmation is, "So that, as for us, from now on no one do we know according to flesh." He then repeats the statement with emphasis on the fact that "we" formerly had the kind of knowledge, κατὰ σάρκα, which we now have no longer, and specifies Christ as one of whom our knowledge has changed from the old kind to the new. "Although we have known according to flesh Christ, yet (ἀλλά) now no longer do we know." Our new knowing of Christ must be fully parallel to our new knowing of every man, and therefore it cannot be a knowing of the heavenly in contrast to the earthly Jesus, for this distinction does not apply to other men; v. 16a cannot be so understood. The two ways of knowing all men, and, as an instance, Christ, belong to the same person or persons (ἡμεῖς), but to different times. By ὥστε the assertion of v. 16a is made a consequence of vv. 14—15, in which, in distinction from vv. 11—13, Paul is describing not his own experience only, but that of every Christian, as he is also in the second ὥστε, v. 17. There is therefore no reason for taking ἡμεῖς as an emphatic "I", as Weiss is obliged to assume, supposing that Paul turns back in this single verse to his own distinctive personal experience.

Οὐδένα is naturally to be interpreted in the light of πάντες in vv. 14—15. But this connection leaves the question open whether the word means, no one of all for whom Christ died, or no one of "the all" who have died with Christ, of "the living" who no longer live to themselves. Is it no man, or no Christian, whom, from now on, we know κατὰ σάρκα? The "Christ" in v. 16b might incline us to the latter opinion, for the Christian's new knowing

of Christ is the knowing which is the love that Christ deserves because of what he has suffered for us (v. 15b). But on the other hand "the love of Christ" which now impelled Paul was love to the undeserving, to all men, love in advance of any change in them, and creative of change, a love that calls forth love in the unloving. That Paul understands this his whole ministry proves. He loves his converts, no doubt, with a peculiar love, but he is possessed by a love which constantly drives him on to new places and new people. He is debtor both to Greeks and Barbarians, to wise and foolish. That there is no longer any distinction between Jew and Greek (Ro. 10 12, Col. 3 11) means not that there is already a change in them, but that the mind of Paul and of every Christian toward *all men* has changed, according to Christ, from hatred, fear, selfishness, to love. So that *οὐδένα* is, I think, to be taken in its natural, unlimited sense, no one of the all for whom Christ died. The love whose self-denials are described in 4 7—15 and 6 3—10, is, like Christ's, a love not only to friends but to enemies. "We," Christians, therefore see *all men* in the new light which Christ casts upon them, or rather with the new eyes, the new nature, that Christ creates in us. We know all men no longer as we formerly did and as men commonly do, and that not because they are already different, but because we are different. So the fact that "we" know Christ also no longer *κατὰ σάρκα* (v. 16b) means not that he is no longer *σάρξ* but *πνεῦμα*, but that we are no longer *sarkical* but spiritual.

The *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* of 16a, and the *νῦν οὐκέτι* of 16b, can only be understood in accordance with vv. 14—15 (see the *μηκέτι*) and v. 17. The contrast is between those, Paul and others, who are constrained by the love of Christ, who have died and risen with Christ and now live for and in Christ, and their own former selves. The "now" is the time that begins with conversion.

The position of the words *κατὰ σάρκα* in both clauses certainly favors the view that they are to be taken with the verbs, and not with their objects. They characterize two ways of knowing, two contrasted total attitudes of one person toward another, the un-Christian and the Christian. This connection of *κατὰ σάρκα*

with the verbs seems now to be generally accepted (in contrast e. g. to Meyer's emphatic assertion of the objective, in contrast to the subjective reference of the phrase); but Weiss is not the only one who fails to see that this connection excludes any reference to the earthly in contrast to the heavenly Christ.

To construe *κατὰ σάρκα* with *οἴδαμεν* and *ἐγνώκαμεν* does indeed leave an important alternative open. The word *σάρξ* can mean the outward, sensible or physical nature of man, or his sinful nature, everything in him which is un-Christian. To know men *κατὰ σάρκα* may therefore mean to judge men according to their earthly and outward qualities and relationships, according to their looks, race, rank, possessions, in contrast to knowing them in their inward and real character and worth. So Moffatt translates, "I estimate no one by what is external," and Goodspeed, "I have estimated nobody at what he seemed to be outwardly." But it may equally well mean to have toward others the common human attitude of suspicion, distrust, envy, fear, hatred, in a word the selfish, unloving feelings and purposes which are contrary to the mind of Christ. There is no doubt a certain relationship between knowing people externally and knowing them selfishly, as Paul's use of the word *σάρξ* in both directions itself suggests. In the case of the verse before us both its immediate and its larger connections seem to me to indicate that Paul is thinking of the attitude of unselfish love as the new creation of Christ, in contrast to the natural attitude of enmity between men. So that he means here to say not that "we" formerly knew men according to *their* flesh, outwardly, but that we knew them according to *our* flesh, selfishly. Even if the other meaning were allowed it would not result that Paul is thinking of a former knowledge of the earthly in contrast to a present knowledge of the heavenly Christ. He would rather be contrasting a former judging of Christ by appearances, by the lowliness of his lot and the shame of his death, with the present recognition of his real nature, of the divine excellence and glory of his self-denying love. Only in this sense could the same distinction be applied to our knowing of

all men, as it is in v. 16a. But I believe that κατὰ σάρκα here means selfishly, not outwardly. Paul has just described those whom we would call Christians as those who are impelled by the love of Christ, those who, having died with Christ in that death for all which was the supreme act of love for all, now no longer live to themselves. Their new attitude of unselfish love is first toward Christ (15b), and then, like Christ's, toward all men. The opposite of this, the old which this new displaces, is the attitude of those who are controlled by self-love, who live to themselves; and this Paul could well call a knowing of men according to flesh. A brief suggestion of the proof of this will suffice.

In 2 Cor. 1 17 Paul defends himself against the appearance of fickleness and selfishness in not having fulfilled his promise to visit Corinth. Does this mean, he asks, that what I purpose I purpose κατὰ σάρκα, that I say yes, and mean no? Paul's answer is that his yes, like Christ's, means only yes, but that it was for their sake that he changed his mind. Here κατὰ σάρκα has nothing to do with what is physical or outward. It means simply selfishly, for his own ease or pleasure. In 1 Cor. 3 3–4 Paul charges the Corinthians with being fleshly (σαρκικοί) because there was among them jealousy and strife; and that meant that they were walking κατὰ ἄνθρωπον. Because one said, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, they were but ἄνθρωποι, that is, they were not really Christians. This passage shows quite precisely what I suppose 2 Cor. 5 16 to mean.

The works of the flesh as Paul enumerates them, fall into the two categories of sensuality and selfishness; and the contrasted qualities of the fruit of the spirit are almost all those that contradict self-assertion and self-concern. The contrast between the old man and the new is the contrast between anger, wrath, malice, division, and that image of Christ which is described as a heart of compassion, kindness, lowliness, meekness, longsuffering, forbearance, forgiveness, and above all love. Passages such as these (Gal. 5 16–26; Col. 3 5–17) certainly justify one in interpreting flesh as, for Paul, above all, selfishness (cf. Gal. 5 13–15), as spirit is, above all, love. Flesh, the un-Christian nature of

man, shows its quality toward other men in its contrast to love. The phrase 'to know men κατὰ σάρκα' could not have a more Pauline meaning than to have toward men feelings contrary to a love like Christ's, to think of others and to act toward them in the ways natural to one who lives to himself and seeks his own. These feelings and this conduct are what Paul finds that Christ has brought to an end. They are no longer natural to the Christian.

That this is what Paul means by saying that "we" (Christians) no longer know anyone according to flesh — as men commonly know men — is confirmed by the larger connection (chapters 1–7). There is here space only to refer to the two striking, powerfully drawn pictures of the complete unselfishness of the Christian life which we find before and after the passage we are considering (2 Cor. 4 7–15; 6 3–10). These are descriptions of the new self that lives when the old self has died. It is a new ideal, so contrary to common human ways of thinking and feeling that only by paradoxes can it put itself into human language. These are poems on the irrationality of the higher reason, the foolishness which is divinely wise and the weakness which is divinely strong, the sacrifice and suffering which are gain and joy, as Paul experienced them in and with Christ. But not Paul alone. It is surely a mistake to translate "we" by "I" in these passages, as our newer versions do. Nothing in these pictures of the Christian ideal of self-denying love is peculiar to Paul. Paul knows what he is doing when he uses "we" as he does here, and when he is compelled to say "I", as he is in 2 Cor. 10–13. Compare the definitely individual experiences described in 11 16–12 10 with these concrete, but typical, not individual, pictures of the Christian. They are the best expositions of what Paul meant by being constrained by the love of Christ, dying with him, living not to oneself; and therefore the best answer to the question what new attitude toward men has taken the place of that 'knowing of men according to flesh' which has come to an end.

Perhaps Paul says with such emphasis "from now on, no one" and "but now no more" as a challenge and a warning. Perhaps he would have the Corinthians realize that this completely new

and superhuman mind and conduct toward one another and toward all men, which rightly belongs to their new nature as Christians, was in reality not fully attained and practiced by them (compare 1 Cor. 1–4). As if Paul had said, from now on let the old human nature be really past and dead. If one is in Christ let him now walk according to Christ.

But how does this understanding of 16a apply to 16b and to the past and present knowing of Christ? We are at once struck by the fact that the word Χριστόν is unexpected, and even seems out of place. As v. 16 as a whole would not be missed if it were lacking, so of the word Χριστόν. But in both cases a later insertion is hard to account for, just because no need for it would be felt, and it is best to accept both the verse and the word as from Paul. If we omit the word we have a fitting repetition of the thought of 16a, with added emphasis on the fact that "we" actually did once have the attitude toward men which we now have no longer. No object of the verb is expressed in the last clause and none is needed in the first, where Χριστόν stands. "Although we have (in reality) had this un-Christlike attitude, we now no longer have it." Paul likes to make reference to Christ in connection with whatever he may be saying about the Christian life; but if he wished to do so here we should more naturally have expected him to say: "Although we have known [men] according to flesh (κατὰ σάρκα), yet now we know them according to Christ (κατὰ Χριστόν)." This would seem to give the needed culmination of the thought of the whole verse, setting the positive over against the negative expression of it, and giving to Christ the place in the great change from the old to the new which is given to him in vv. 14–15, 17. He is the one who creates the new nature in man, who defines or constitutes the new attitude of the Christian toward all men. Why then does Paul insert Christ as an illustration of those (all men) whom we no longer know in the old human way, rather than as the one who first illustrated the new way of knowing? In fact Christ stood in both places in the thought of Paul. It is as Pauline to say that we should have toward all men the love that we have toward Christ, as that we should have

toward all the love that Christ had toward all. We are to be as Christ, for Christ (cf. ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ in 5 20), toward men, and we are also to feel toward men as we feel toward Christ. Men are to see Christ in us, but we are to see Christ in them. Christ is the first who manifested this new love and who calls it forth in his followers, but he is also the first toward whom the disciple feels it, and by that experience learns to know what it is. That Paul chooses to express the second of these aspects of the Christian experience is quite characteristic of him. He has already made the first unmistakably clear. It is the love of Christ constraining us, it is the death and resurrection of Christ for us becoming our death to self, which transforms our knowing of all men. But Paul has already intimated (v. 15b) that this change in us is first of all a change in our attitude toward Christ himself. Paul chooses to remind his readers, though, as it were, only in passing, that they had formerly had the old attitude of hatred, ill-will, contempt, indifference, even toward him whom they now most loved. The newness which Paul is describing consists therefore not only in their being toward other men as Christ first was, but also in their taking toward other men the new attitude which they had taken first toward Christ.

This understanding of v. 16b is in accordance with v. 16a. It involves no change in the meaning of knowing men according to the flesh. It involves no sudden turn from a thought applicable to all Christians to an experience peculiar to Paul. It is true that Paul had been a persecutor of Christ, and in his case, before his conversion, there had been no one else toward whom he felt the emotions of hatred, fear, enmity, so intensely as toward him. He had indeed known Christ after the flesh. But it was true of all converts to the new religion that their conversion was first of all a change of mind toward Christ from contempt, indifference, if not from active hostility, to love. The knowledge of Christ, which, being according to flesh, has now for every Christian come to an end, is therefore not, in any sense, real or hypothetical, a knowledge of his earthly in contrast to his heavenly being. A knowledge of his earthly life was essential to Paul's Christianity.

He could not forget what he knew about it even if he had wished to do so, and he could not wish to lose whatever of such knowledge he possessed. Nor is the knowledge according to flesh a knowledge of his outward appearance and lot in contrast to his inner and real nature and worth. "We have known according to flesh Χριστόν", means according to our flesh, not according to his. It is our former knowledge of Christ that has ended, and a wholly new knowledge has taken its place. But between the earthly Jesus and the exalted Lord and Spirit there was for Paul no such opposition. The identity of these two was essential to his Christology. Paul could not say "from now on no more" of Jesus himself, but only of something in his own nature and that of others which Jesus had made to cease.

If Paul had really intended to discuss here the question of his own relation to the earthly Jesus in contrast to that of Peter and James, it is incredible that he would have begun with a sentence about his own, and all Christians', relation to every man; nor could the word Christ have come in so incidentally. If the accusation had been made that he was no true apostle because he had not known Jesus he would have given his best attention to it. So obscure and slight an allusion to it is quite incomprehensible. Instead of this, what Paul is really writing about is the new, characteristic and distinctive love which separates the Christian from his own past self. In a way and for a time it inevitably distinguishes him also from his fellowmen; but since that which distinguishes him is self-denying love, the distinction works toward its own overcoming and removal.

The interpretation I have given seems to me to be the one which best meets the conditions and tests enumerated above. It understands the two halves of the verse as truly parallel, and reads the second member in the light of the first. It is consistent in connecting κατὰ σάρκα with the verbs, and defining "to know according to flesh" in a way consistent with Paul's principal affirmation about it, namely, that for the Christian it no longer exists. It fits into its immediate connection, vv. 14—17, in its thought, and in the fact that it does not require Paul to say any-

thing peculiar to his own personal experience. It finds a reason for the reference to Christ without changing the meaning of the verse as a whole.

This discussion, long as it is, leaves important matters which are involved in the study of the verse without adequate treatment. The interpretation of the verse which I have given came to me in the course of a study of the thoughts of 2 Cor. 1–7, and especially the important bearing of these chapters on what might be called the self-problem in Paul's Christian experience and reflection. There is not space in the present essay to retrace that path of approach.

I had reached the conclusions here set forth before reading the commentary of Bachmann, in which some of them are already given. Bachmann excludes all reference in the verse to the historical Jesus in contrast to the heavenly Christ, because such an interpretation of 16b does not apply to 16a; because *κατὰ σάρκα* describes one of two ways of knowing, and does not distinguish two sorts of men known, nor two Christs; and because *κατὰ σάρκα* describes an ungodly way of knowing, which ends when men become Christian, whereas there is nothing sinful in knowing the historical Jesus, and no reason why such knowledge should end. With this negative answer to the question which is the title of this essay and with these reasons for it I agree. I do not assent to Bachmann's insistence that v. 16 is subjective and personal, whereas v. 17 is objective and universal; that is, that Paul in v. 16 is speaking of himself alone, and as an apostle. Nor do I find light in the opinion that the knowing of Christ according to flesh means Paul's former Jewish, legalistic judgment and rejection of Christ. It seems to me better, more fitting in 16a and more in accordance with the immediate and the larger connection, to understand *σάρξ* here as un-Christian, not in the narrower sense of Jewish legalism and exclusiveness, but in the general sense of human selfishness and ill-will.[1]

[1] One does not like to stand alone in an opinion of this kind. If it is a natural inference from vv. 14–15 it should have occurred to others. I am glad therefore to discover that de Wette (*Kurzgefaßtes Exeg. Handbuch*

Returning to the assertion of Weiss with which we began, we must declare it to be not well founded. The verse has no bearing on the question whether Paul had seen the earthly Jesus. The possibility that he had cannot be excluded. Even the probability may maintain itself because of the need of some such explanation of the very personal character of Paul's relation of loyalty and love toward the person, Jesus Christ, and perhaps also because of the remarkable degree in which Paul made his own the deeper thoughts of Jesus and the distinctive quality of his mind and spirit. Paul makes no claim, here or elsewhere, to have seen the earthly Jesus; yet inferences from what he does *not* refer to in his letters should be made only with extreme caution.

zum N. T.) gives it as one of two alternatives in his interpretation of both 16a and 16b. Κατὰ σάρκα in any case, he says, belongs to the verb; but it can be taken either objectively: to know one according to that which he is in his natural self apart from Christ, according to outward prerogatives or relationships, whether he be Jew or Greek, wise or unwise, *etc.*; or subjectively: with selfishness, according to the measure of one's own selfish advantage. These two do, however, in substance coincide, since it is just the outer self of the other person in which the selfish man is interested. In the same way to know Christ according to the flesh may be taken objectively: of the human side, the human characteristics, of Christ: or subjectively: according to the human way of regarding men, "not yet to have apprehended Christ so that, with the renunciation of fleshly selfishness, one lives to him alone (v. 15)." The same alternatives are discussed above (pp. 268–9), and reasons given for preferring the second. Meyer cites de Wette only on v. 16b, and gives as his view only the second of the two alternatives between which he does not decide; the first one is essentially Meyer's own. Meyer then gives three objections to de Wette's view as thus inaccurately defined: (1) that it is subjective; which is a reason for, not against, it, since κατὰ σάρκα is to be construed with the verb; (2) that it does not apply to 16a; but de Wette did so apply it, and that it fits both halves is one proof of its truth; (3) that it does not fit Paul's own pre-Christian knowledge of Christ as a persecutor; but to make it fit perfectly it is only necessary to take selfishness as including all that is contrary to love.

De Wette is the only one that I have discovered who has suggested just this understanding of Paul's phrase "to know according to flesh." He gives it as one of two possibilities, without discussion or proof beyond the reference to v. 15.

TRANSLATION GREEK IN THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON

CARL EVERETT PURINTON
ADELPHI COLLEGE

I

THE central question in the long-continued discussion of the apocryphal Book of Wisdom, or Wisdom of Solomon, has been that of unity. There have been three main periods or cycles of criticism. In the opening period of what may be termed "modern" criticism, such writers as Houbigant[1], Eichhorn[2], Nachtigal[3], Bretschneider[4], Bertholdt[5], and Engelbreth[6] were united in the belief that the book was of composite authorship. Eichhorn, it must be added, qualified his verdict by declaring that the sharp difference in ideas between the earlier and later chapters could be explained only on the basis of a different author for the second

[1] C. F. Houbigant, *Lectori ad libros Sapientiae et Ecclesiastici*, in preface to Biblia Hebraica, Paris 1753; bound separately as *Prolegomena in Scripturam Sacram*, 1753; reprinted in *Notae criticae in universos V. T. libros*, etc., Frankfurt 1777.

[2] J. G. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in die Apocryphischen Schriften des A. T.*, pp. 88ff.; 144ff.; 200f., 1795.

[3] J. C. C. Nachtigal, *Die Versammlungen der Weisen*, II part, *Das Buch der Weisheit*, Halle 1799.

[4] C. G. Bretschneider, *De Libri Sapientiae Parte Priore Cap. I-XI E Duobus Libellis Diversis Conflata*, Vitebergae 1804.

[5] L. Bertholdt, *Histor. krit. Einleitung in sämtliche kanonische und apokryph. Schriften des A. und N. T.*, V. vol., first part, 2261ff., Erlangen 1815.

[6] W. F. Engelbreth, *Libri, qui vulgo inscribitur Sapientia Salomonis latine conversi et explicati specimina* (2 vols.), Kopenhagen 1816.

part, or on the hypothesis that the later and inferior chapters were composed in the years of the writer's immaturity, long before the earlier.

The second cycle of criticism centers in the work of Grimm[7], who in 1860 gathered up the results of a lifetime of study and published what has since remained the standard, or as some would say, the "only" commentary worthy of the name dealing with the Book of Wisdom to the present day. Grimm concluded in favor of the unity of the book, fairly meeting and evaluating the arguments presented by Houbigant, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Bretschneider, and Nachtigal in turn. In his summary of arguments *pro* and *con*, Grimm built upon the work of critics immediately before him who had initiated the tendency toward the unity of the book, such as Heydenreich[8], Gfrörer[9], and especially Bauermeister[10], and by the thoroughness and fairness of his judgments lent conviction to the belief in the unity of the Book of Wisdom, a belief which still prevails in many quarters.

The turn of the century has witnessed a growing reluctance to accept the hitherto unquestioned findings of Grimm, and a renewed tendency to question the single authorship of the Wisdom of Solomon. Among those who still remain loyal are Siegfried[11], Goodrick[12], and Feldmann[13], yet an even longer array of names may be adduced for the opposite opinion. Among those who now suggest a division of the book may be listed Lincke[14], Weber[15],

[7] C. L. W. Grimm, *Commentar über das Buch der Weisheit*, Leipzig 1837; *Das Buch der Weisheit* (Kurzgefaßtes Handbuch), Leipzig 1860.

[8] M. Heydenreich, in Tzschirner's *Memorabilien*, Leipzig 1815.

[9] A. F. Gfrörer, *Philo*, vol. II, pp. 200–272, 1831.

[10] *Commentarius in Sapientiam Salomonis*, Gottingae 1828.

[11] K. Siegfried, in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A. T.*, Tübingen 1900.

[12] A. T. S. Goodrick, *The Book of Wisdom*, New York 1913.

[13] F. Feldmann, *Das Buch der Weisheit*, Bonn 1926.

[14] K. F. A. Lincke, *Samaria und seine Propheten*, Tübingen and Leipzig 1903.

[15] W. Weber, "Die Komposition der Weisheit Salomo's", in *Zeitschrift für Wiss. Theol.* 27 (1904), pp. 145–169.

Kohler[16], Gärtner[17], Holmes[18], Focke[19], Peters[20], and Speiser[21]. Especially worthy of note in this third cycle of discussion is the feeling of certain critics of the accepted point of view that the final court of appeal must be the question of the original language of the Book of Wisdom, and not as in the past, the question of the likeness or difference of the fundamental ideas in different sections of the book. This appeal to language considerations is in harmony with a larger movement represented by Klostermann, Burney, Montgomery and Torrey, the thesis of which is that many supposedly Greek documents in which a Semitic idiom is to be observed are in reality translations of Semitic sources. This point of view may be illustrated by a quotation from Professor Torrey[22] in an article entitled *Translations Made from Aramaic Gospels*:

> It has been customary to appeal to certain books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and to the Apocalypse of the New Testament, as examples of writings composed in Semitic-sounding Greek; but the fact is that all of the books thus cited as witnesses were originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic, and our Greek versions are merely translations more or less literal.

As early as Houbigant we find the suggestion that chs. 1—9 of the Wisdom of Solomon were written in Hebrew, while chs. 10—19 were added later in Greek, perhaps by the same person who translated chs. 1—9. Bretschneider attempted to prove that Hebrew was the original language of 1 1—6 8. Recent interest in the original language of the book dates from an article written

[16] *Jewish Encyclopedia*, "Book of the Wisdom of Solomon", 1906.

[17] E. Gärtner, *Komposition und Wortwahl des Buches der Weisheit*, Berlin 1912.

[18] S. Holmes, (in Charles' *Apocrypha*), "The Wisdom of Solomon", 1913.

[19] F. Focke, *Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos*, Göttingen 1913.

[20] N. Peters, "Ein hebräischer alphabetischer Psalm in der Weisheit Salomos, Kap. 9", *Bibl. Zeitschrift*, 14, pp. 1–14, 1916.

[21] E. A. Speiser, "The Heb. Origin of the First Part of the Book of Wisdom", *Jewish Quarterly Review*, April 1924.

[22] *Studies in the History of Religion*, presented to C. H. Toy, New York, 1912, p. 288.

by D. S. Margoliouth, "Was the Book of Wisdom Written in Hebrew?"[23] in which the author cited 12 alleged cases of mistranslation. In the following year, Professor Freudenthal[24] replied with an article in which he accepted the importance of mistranslations, if they could be proved, but showed that the cases presented were not convincing, and marshalled the different reasons for believing the book to be an original Greek composition. At present interest centers in the suggestion of Focke[25] that chs. 1–5 have been translated from Hebrew by the same writer who composed chs. 6–19 in Greek, a view strikingly similar to the tentative proposal of Houbigant, at the very beginning of modern criticism of Wisdom. This hypothesis of a single translator-author has the great advantage of accounting both for the differences and the likenesses between the earlier and later chapters. It disposes, for example, of the striking misuse of *metalleuein* in both sections of the book, 4 12 and 16 25. As elaborated by Focke this theory becomes a very plausible solution of some of the main problems of the Book of Wisdom. The late Professor Gressmann[26] accepted this explanation, although he would not deny the possibility that there might be some originally Semitic material in chs. 6–19 and some originally Greek in chs. 1–5. By an interesting coincidence, Speiser arrived independently, although later, at much the same conclusion as Focke; namely, that the translator of the first part is at the same time the author of the second section. Speiser determined upon a different division of the book as follows: (1) 1 1–6 21; 8 1–9 18; (2) 6 22–7 30; 10 1–19 22. The especial value of Speiser's article lies in the 11 concrete cases where he claims to have found actual mistranslations from the Hebrew. These form a valuable supplement to the argument of Focke, who mentioned only three cases in which he considered a mistranslation to be apparent: 5 7; 1 3, and 2 6.

[23] *JRAS*, 1890, pp. 263ff.

[24] J. Freudenthal, "What is the Original Language of the Wisdom of Solomon?" *JQR*, Vol. 3, 1891, pp. 722–753.

[25] *Op. cit.*, pp. 65, 66.

[26] *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1914, Nr. 29, 18 J, p. 1815.

A survey of the discussion of the book in the past leads one to the opinion that if further progress toward a conclusion regarding the main problem of unity is to be reached, it will be through an appeal to the original language of the book. The long-continued discussion of differences in thought, etc., seems to yield no promise of final agreement. It is the purpose of the present writer to give further consideration to the evidence of the text itself which suggests that the first part of the book is a translation from Hebrew.

II

In the Wisdom of Solomon, as elsewhere, the clue to Translation Greek is, in general, the awkwardness which arises in the tendency to transfer words and not ideas from the original into the translation. Before dealing in detail with more important passages, there are a number of phrases in the book which may obviously be called Hebraisms. Some of these are: 1 9, *ἀκοὴ* (שמועה); 1 10, *οὗς ζηλώσεως*; 1 12, *ἔργοις χειρῶν ὑμῶν* (במעשי ידכם); 2 24, *οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος ὄντες*; 3 4, *ἐν ὄψει ἀνθρώπων*; 3 9, *ὅτι χάρις καὶ ἔλεος ἐν τοῖς ὁσίοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ*; cf. 4 14; 6 1, *δικασταὶ περάτων γῆς*; 6 2, *ἀνωτίσασθε γεγαυρωμένοι ἐπὶ* (התנשא); 6 3, *παρὰ Ὑψίστου*, cf. 5 15 (*παρὰ* equal to מאת); 9 4, *ἐκ παίδων σου* (instead of *ἐκ τῶν παίδων σου*); 9 6, *ἐν υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων*; 9 17, *ἀπὸ ὑψίστων*; 10 16, *ἐν τέρασι καὶ σημείοις*; 10 17, *καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς εἰς σκέπην ἡμέρας καὶ εἰς φλόγα ἄστρων τὴν νύκτα* (cf. 14 11, *εἰς βδέλυγμα*; 14 21, *εἰς ἔνεδρον*); 11 1, *ἐν χειρὶ προφήτου ἁγίου*.

In addition to the Hebraisms listed above, a detailed explanation is given in the following pages of the more striking instances of translation-idiom. In certain cases we have merely to deal with peculiarities in the Greek which strongly suggest a common Hebrew idiom; in other examples it is possible to clarify the meaning of passages hopelessly obscured for those who adhere to an original Greek text; and on occasion it is possible to demonstrate an actual mistranslation of the Hebrew original.

1 1 — *ἐν ἁπλότητι καρδίας.*

"In singleness of heart."

This particular phrase in the Greek is found in only one other passage of the Septuagint. That is 1 Chr. 29 17, where it renders the Hebrew בישר לבבי.

The words *ἁπλότης*, *ἁπλοσύνη*, *ἁπλοῦν*, *ἁπλοῦς*, *ἁπλῶς* almost invariably render some derivative of the root תם used in the ethical sense; thus in 21 places in the old Greek translations of the O. T.

The usual Heb. idiom is בְּתֻם־לֵבָב; see Gen. 20 5, 6; 1 Ki. 9 4; Ps. 78 72; 101 2.

We happen to know that this idiom was rendered by *ἁπλότης καρδίας* in Gen. 20 5 by Symmachus, and in Ps. 78 72 by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. (It was doubtless rendered in this way by one or more of these translators in other passages, where we have no record.)

In 2 Sam. 15 11, LXX renders לְתֻמָּם by *ἐν τῇ ἁπλότητι αὐτῶν.* Cf. Susanna 63; 1 Macc. 2 37, 60, and Aq., Sym., Th. in Prov. 28 6.

Hence, in Wisd. 1 1 we seem to have a close translation of a standing Hebrew phrase, viz. the idiom בתם לבב.

1 5c — *καὶ ἐλεγχθήσεται ἐπελθούσης ἀδικίας.*

No convincing translation of this verse has been made by those who claim that Greek is the original language of the book. In the translation of the convenient SPCK series, Oesterley made the conjecture, "And *is abashed* at the approach of unrighteousness," adding the obvious truth that "the meaning of the Greek is uncertain."

The difficulty comes, of course, not in translating the verb *ἐλεγχθήσεται* but in making a translation which will make sense in this context. The variety of translations which have been suggested shows that translators have not found a satisfactory reading. The AV evaded the problem by reading into 5 c the meaning of the preceding lines: "For the holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit, and remove from thoughts that are without understanding, and *will not abide* when unrighteousness cometh in." This is something that might possibly be said about the holy

spirit of discipline, but it is not in any sense a translation of the word we have before us. The editors of the RV translated more literally, but with a corresponding loss in the sense of the passage: "And *will be put to confusion* when unrighteousness hath come in," with the marginal reading, "convicted."

Some such reading as "abashed," "ashamed," "be put to confusion" might seem possible, if considered apart from the biblical usage of ἐλέγχειν. In biblical Greek, however, the verb has the primary meaning "convict," "chasten," "rebuke," while the meaning to be "abashed," "ashamed," "put to confusion" is secondary and always carries with it the implication of the primary meaning. Thus a sense of shame or confusion is what results from the conviction of wrongdoing. That such a thing could be said of the holy spirit of discipline, or in other words, of *Sophia*, of the Spirit of God (for these words seem to be used almost interchangeably), is unthinkable.

That this meaning "convict" is to be connected with the Greek verb in question becomes almost inescapable when we compare with it the usage of this same writer in other parts of the book. Some form of the verb is used in five other places and in every case with the general meaning of "convict" or its equivalent.

Thus in 1 3 the RV reads, "And the Supreme Power . . . putteth to confusion (marg. 'convicteth') the foolish." Line 1 8 has, "Neither shall Justice, when it convicteth, pass him by." In 2 11 we find, "For that which is weak is found to be of no service (marg. 'convicted')." Line 4 20 reads, "And their lawless deeds shall convict them to their face." Finally in 12 2, we read, "Wherefore thou convictest by little and little them that . . . . ."

Furthermore, the noun of the same root occurs in the following passages: 1 9; 2 14; 11 6; 17 7 and 18 5, and the meaning in every case is that of "conviction," translated variously "reproof," "rebuke."

Thus we come to what amounts to an impasse if we are to accept the Greek as the original of this passage. It is hardly possible to accept the reading, "(the holy spirit of discipline) will be convicted" or even "will be put to confusion (with the implic-

ation of guilt)." On the other hand, that is clearly what the word ἐλέγχειν means as used in other parts of the book and this is in harmony with the Septuagint usage.

Is it possible to throw light on the question on the hypothesis of a mistranslation from the original Hebrew? Two conjectures have been made, both of which give sense to the context, which is an improvement over the hypothesis of a Greek original, at least. Focke, following Bretschneider, assumes that the translator had before him תּוֹכִיחַ (ἐλέγξει) which he read as תּוּכַח (ἐλεγχθήσεται). Of these two Hebrew forms, the active or Hifil occurs exceedingly frequently, while one citation of the passive or Hofal form is listed by Hatch and Redpath, in Job. 33 19, translated "is chastened." It would be difficult to conjecture this meaning "to be chastened" in connection with our passage, but the active meaning "to chastise" or "to convict" fits into the sense of the context admirably.

Speiser finds this hypothesis "hardly a felicitous one." He conjectures that the translator had before him the form תּוּסַר, which he mistook for תָּוָסֶר. "The line thus restored ought to be rendered: 'And will *remove*, when unrighteousness cometh in'." This suggestion has the virtue of giving us a verse in which all three members are parallel:

> "For a holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit,
> And will start away from thoughts that are without understanding,
> And will remove, when unrighteousness cometh in."

On the other hand, is it the character of the "holy spirit of discipline" to depart from the scene when unrighteousness enters in? Is not the duty of discipline to punish those who are unrighteous in word or deed? In other words, is the nature of "*Paideia-Sophia*" entirely passive?

By omitting line 1 6a, a line which hardly seems to belong to this part of Wisdom (see Focke, pp. 69, 70), Focke obtains in lines 5a b c and 6b, two couplets which present both attributes of "*Paideia-Sophia*" the active and the passive. Omitting 6a we obtain:

"For a holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit,
And will start away from thoughts that are without understanding.
But will convict when unrighteousness hath come in,
And will not hold a blasphemer guiltless for his lips."

The word "But" in 5 c is substituted for the usual "And" because it fits the context better and is equally possible as a translation of the Hebrew connective (Focke, p. 70).

Whatever be said of either of the above suggestions, they have the advantage of providing a translation which gives sense to the context in which the disputed passage is found. This is something at least which cannot be said for any readings from the accepted Greek text.

1 14 — *ἔκτισεν γὰρ εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα,*
καὶ σωτήριοι αἱ γενέσεις τοῦ κόσμου.

The RV translates these lines:

"For he created all things *that they might have being*:
And the generative powers of the world are *healthsome*."

While the RV may make idiomatic English, it is nonsense in this connection. Of course, whatever is created has "being," but the question here is how long it is to last.

Εἰς τὸ εἶναι is not idiomatic Greek. The variant (55) reading *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* is a mere worthless guess here.

Is it possible to obtain the obvious sense of the passage on the hypothesis of a mistranslation from the Hebrew? The phrase *εἰς τὸ εἶναι* would be, of course, the rendering of לְהִיוֹת. But is that the meaning here? Is not the contrast here between *life* and *death*, and does not the writer mean to say that things were created *to live* rather than *to be*? In this case, the original Hebrew would be לְחִיוֹת. This is good Hebrew idiom and makes good sense in the context.

In like manner, in the next line, isn't the meaning that the "origins of the universe" (תּוֹלְדוֹת תֵּבֵל) were "life-giving" (מַחֲיוֹת)? *Σωτήριοι* would be a good rendering.

Thus restored from the original Hebrew, the translation of the verse reads:

"For he created all things that they might have life,
And the origins of the universe are life-giving,
Etc."

1 16 — ἀσεβεῖς δὲ ταῖς χερσὶν καὶ τοῖς λόγοις προσεκαλέσαντο αὐτόν,
φίλον ἡγησάμενοι αὐτὸν ἐτάκησαν,
καὶ συνθήκην ἔθεντο πρὸς αὐτόν,
ὅτι ἄξιοί εἰσιν τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος εἶναι.

"But ungodly men by their hands and their words called *death* unto them.
Deeming *him* a friend they consumed away,
And they made a covenant with *him*,
Because they were worthy to be of his portion." (RV).

The RV clearly gives the meaning when it translates "death" in 1 16 a, but the word is not found in the Greek. The αὐτόν, repeated three times in this verse and the ἐκείνου refer to θάνατος, *which, however, has not been expressed.* Nor is it expressed in the Greek of the preceding line:

δικαιοσύνη γὰρ ἀθάνατός ἐστιν.

But if we consider the possibility here of translation Greek, it is evident that v. 15 could not be expressed in Heb. without the word "death" (מות), compounded with בלי or some other negative. Although there is no suggestion here of a mistranslation, yet the origin of the Greek becomes clear when we consider it as a translation from the Hebrew.

Incidentally, the troublesome word ἐτάκησαν is probably a mere corruption of ἐκράτησαν: "Deeming him a friend *they laid hold upon him.*"

2 5 — κατεσφραγίσθη.
"Fast sealed."

The verse, in which this word occurs, reads in the AV. "And our end retreateth not; Because it is fast sealed, and none turneth it back."

The word is not common in the LXX, being listed only three times by Tromm. It is, however, a familiar Hebrew idiom, and in Job. 9 7; 37 7, and also in Deuteronomy 32 34 (ἐσφράγισται) is represented in the original by חתם.

2 6 — καὶ χρησώμεθα τῇ κτίσει ὡς νεότητι σπουδαίως.

"Come on therefore, let us enjoy the good things that are present: and let us speedily use the creatures *like as in youth.*" (AV).

"Come therefore and let us enjoy the good things
that now are;
And let us use the creation with all our soul
as youth's possession." (RV).

While the above translations make idiomatic English, they merely serve to hide the difficulty of the Greek. The most probable ms. reading is ὡς νεότητι, although Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus read νεότητος. The Old Latin reads "*tanquam in iuventute*" and the Peshitta "in our youth."

That this difficulty in the Greek is one of long standing may be judged from the varied attempts at translation. Grimm a first favored the meaning "eagerly as is fitting for youth," but later supported the reading ἐν νεότητι, "in youth." Siegfried accepts this with a reference to the Hebrew of Eccles. 11 9, בְּיַלְדוּתֶךָ, "in thy youth." Some such translation as this, "in youth" or "while we are young" is obviously the sense of the passage, but the difficulty of the Greek is not solved thereby. The literal translation, "And let us earnestly use creation like youth" is, as Speiser remarks, too vague.

Speiser improves upon the original suggestion of Pfleiderer that νεότης is a slang word for "a girl," and that the meaning is "let us use God's creation as we would a harlot." Speiser refers to the suggestion of Zenner (Feldmann, p. 44) that we

should read in this passage *ὡς νεοττίδι*, "als Freudenmädchen," but remarks, "The sense would in such a case be excellent, but the procedure doubtful." Speiser himself makes the suggestion that the original Hebrew נְעָרוֹת "girls" was read by the translator נַעֲרוּת "youth," in support of which he refers to Eccles. 3 12.

But would "the sense . . . in such a case be excellent?" There is nothing else in the Book of Wisdom to suggest this meaning. The simplest solution on the basis of an original Hebrew text is that of Bretschneider (see Focke, p. 71) that the translator, dealing with an unvocalized text, made the very easy mistake of reading the original ב for the very similar preposition כ. Accepting this hypothesis, we should have in the original Hebrew some such phrase as בַּיַּלְדוּת or perhaps בַּנְּעוּרִים.

Thus here the theory of mistranslation from the Hebrew removes the difficulty of the Greek and gives a translation which is appropriate to the context:

> "Come therefore and let us enjoy the good things that
> now are;
> And let us use the creation with all our soul in youth."

2 16 — *εἰς κίβδηλον ἐλογίσθημεν αὐτῷ.*

"We were accounted of him as base metal . . . ." (RV).

With this verse should be compared 3 17, *εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθήσονται*, and 9 6, *εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθήσεται*. While the verb *λογίζεσθαι* occurs frequently in the Wisdom of Solomon, in connection with *εἰς τὶ* it is found in only these three verses. This is, of course, the familiar Hebrew idiom נֶחְשַׁב לְ, found in 1 Ki. 10 21, לְמְאוּמָה לֹא נֶחְשָׁב . . . . ; Lam. 4 2, נֶחְשְׁבוּ לְנִבְלִי־חֶרֶשׂ; Ps. 106 31, וַתֵּחָשֶׁב לּוֹ לִצְדָקָה; in Is. 40 17, מֵאֶפֶס וָתֹהוּ נֶחְשְׁבוּ־לוֹ, and in other places. The extreme literalness of the Greek in the three passages mentioned strongly suggests the possibility of translation from Hebrew.

4 13 — *ἐπλήρωσεν χρόνους μακρούς.*

This is thought to be a reference to Enoch, the "perfect" man, and is characteristically Hebrew in mode of expression. Goodrick

says "An idiomatic English translation is almost impossible RV 'long years' is not satisfactory), but the sense is plain enough. His moral training was completed early in life, and his few years were as good as very many."

The difficulty of translating this into English idiom is clear enough. But is this even idiomatic Greek? Goodrick considers πληροῦν χρόνον "a Hellenistic expression," following Grimm (p. 105) who says that the expression "gehört nur der hellenistischen Gräcität" an. But the theory of a Jewish-Greek literary idiom has been abandoned by the very scholars who have maintained most consistently the Greek origin of the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and certain books of the New Testament. If there never was any such thing as a literary "Jewish Greek," such an expression as πληροῦν χρόνον cannot have been composed in Greek at all. It can only be a literal translation from the familiar Hebrew idiom found variously in Gen. 25 24; 29 21; Lev. 8 33; 12 4; 25 30; Nu. 6 5; etc.

4 14 — μηδὲ θέντες ἐπὶ διανοίᾳ τὸ τοιοῦτο.

"Neither laying this to heart" (RV).

The Hebrew equivalent of the awkward phrase θέντες ἐπὶ διανοίᾳ is the common שום על־לב. Grimm remarks that the writer probably had in mind the passage in Isaiah 57 1. Inasmuch as the LXX gives an entirely different translation from the above, it is evident that the Hebrew must be the source, if this is the case. Isaiah 57 1 reads, "The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart (הצדיק אָבד ואין איש שם על־לב); and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come." The context here and immediately following is so similar in thought to Wisdom 4 7 ff., that the dependence of Wisdom upon the Hebrew can hardly be doubted.

4 14 — διὰ τοῦτο ἔσπευσεν ἐκ μέσου πονηρίας.

This line has caused translators some difficulty. The AV renders (reading the whole verse), "For his soul pleased the Lord: therefore hasted he *to take him away* from among the wicked."

The editors of the RV preferred to consider not God, but "he," that is, Enoch, as the subject of the verb and accordingly translated, "Therefore hasted he out of the midst of wickedness," adding in the margin, however, the other reading, "*he hastened him away.*"

It is the verb ἔσπευσεν, of course, which causes the difficulty. The reading of the Greek is necessarily ambiguous. If we suppose a Hebrew original, we find that הציל, with the direct object understood, is quite the common thing in Hebrew poetry, and if substituted here, disposes of the ambiguity.

5 16 — *διὰ τοῦτο λήμψονται τὸ βασίλειον τῆς εὐπρεπείας καὶ τὸ διάδημα τοῦ κάλλους ἐκ χειρὸς Κυρίου.*

The AV translated, "Therefore shall they receive a glorious kingdom, and a beautiful crown from the Lord's hand."

> The rendering of the RV is closer to the Greek,
> "Therefore shall they receive the *crown of royal dignity,*
> And the diadem of beauty from the Lord's hand."

The translation "crown" for βασίλειον is a frequent LXX usage. It is also confirmed by the recently published and as yet incomplete *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* by Preisigke, in which "*Königskrone*" is the meaning of the word.

Grimm's objection to this translation (p. 119) seems very weak. He argues, "*nicht Krone . . . denn in diesem Falle würde das Wort ganz dasselbe besagen wie διάδημα; . . . sondern Reich, Herrschaft, wie* 1 14." So far as the reference to 1 14 is concerned, the meaning there is ambiguous and may be rendered "palace" or "crown" with fully as much certainty as "kingdom."

The objection that if βασίλειον be read "crown," we should have the same meaning as in the following line suggests what was probably the case, almost certainly if the original were Hebrew. Such parallelism is exactly what we should expect. Goodrick remarks "that 'Kingdom of splendour', 'diadem of beauty', might well be considered Hebraisms, but whether from such influence

or not, 'genitives of quality' are frequent in New Testament Greek . . ." (p. 162). It is becoming more and more clear that the "frequent" peculiarities of the New Testament Greek mentioned by Goodrick are due to translation from Semitic sources. The evidence here leans in the same direction. Not only does the genitive construction suggest the Hebrew, but the best translation of *βασίλειον* with "crown" gives a balance between "crown of splendor" in the first line and "diadem of beauty" in the second, which is exactly what we should expect in Hebrew but not in Greek.

What we have in this passage may be taken to be a direct allusion to a strikingly similar passage in Is. 62 3. Dependence upon this verse, however, would not be upon the LXX, which reads,

καὶ ἔσῃ στέφανος κάλλους ἐν χειρὶ κυρίου,
καὶ διάδημα βασιλείας ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ σου.

It might easily be argued that the translator had before him something very close to the Hebrew of Is. 62 3, which is

וְהָיִית עֲטֶרֶת תִּפְאֶרֶת בְּיַד יְהוָה
וּצְנִיף מְלוּכָה בְּכַף אֱלֹהָיִךְ.

6 7 — *οὐ γὰρ ὑποστελεῖται πρόσωπον ὁ πάντων δεσπότης.*

"For He which is Lord over all *shall fear no person.*" (AV)
"For the Sovereign Lord of all *will not refrain himself for any man's person.*" (RV)

The translation of the RV suggests better than the AV the awkwardness of *ὑποστελεῖται πρόσωπον*, a phrase clearly foreign to the Greek idiom. It is impossible to believe that the writer of the Wisdom of Solomon, at home in both Alexandrian Greek and Hebrew as we know him to be, composed such a barbarism. It is a clear example of an over-literal translation of a familiar Hebrew idiom. An example of this construction in the Hebrew Bible is found in Deut. 1 17: לא תגורו מפני איש.

8 4 — *μύστις γάρ ἐστιν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιστήμης*
καὶ αἱρετὶς τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ.

The difficulty here centers in the word *αἱρετίς*, which needs to be considered, however, in its context.

The AV gives a dubious translation, "For she is privy to the mysteries of the knowledge of God, and a lover of his works."

Grimm found the word puzzling: "*αἱρετίς, schwerlich weiter vorkommend, kann seiner Etymologie zufolge nichts anderes als electrix* (Vulg.) *bedeuten.*" (p. 169.)

The editors of the RV chose this sense in their translation:

"For she is initiated into the knowledge of God,
And she chooseth out *for him* his works."

Two objections may be made to this translation, one from the point of view of the sense. Isn't this too exalted a position for Wisdom, to say that she "chooses" or "deviseth" what God shall do? This passage is reminiscent of the verses in Prov. 8, where Wisdom is with God from the beginning, but God is the active agent.

Another suggestion might be taken from the principle of parallelism so closely followed in much of this chapter. "To be initiated into the knowledge of God" is a quite different thing from the position of one who "chooses out" for God what he shall enact. Thus the parallelism does not suggest the above readings.

The interesting suggestion has been made by C. C. Torrey and E. A. Speiser, working independently of each other, that the original Hebrew חברת was mistaken by the translator for בחרת. Thus we should read in place of "chooseth out for him his works" some such translation as "And is an associate, sharer in."

On this hypothesis of a misreading of the Hebrew original, we thus have the more natural:

"For she is initiated into the knowledge of God,
And is a sharer in his works."

9 1 — *θεὲ πατέρων καὶ Κύριε τοῦ ἐλέους σου.*

The RV renders this line, "O God of the fathers, and Lord who keepest thy mercy (marg. Lord of thy mercy)." But what sense

is there in the phrase, "Lord who keepest thy mercy"? Nor is the marginal reading of any help. "Lord of *thy* mercy" is never a LXX appellation for God.

The AV avoided part of the difficulty by leaving out the possessive pronoun *σου*, translating "O God of my fathers, and Lord of mercy." Certain manuscript readings support such a translation by the omission of *σου*; namely 106, 248, 254, 261, Compl., but the more important documents preserve the more difficult reading. Even without the troublesome *σου*, Grimm considered the phrase *κύριος ἐλέους* "*ein halber Hebraismus*."

This is a case where the theory of translation out of the Hebrew is especially convincing. According to the concordances, the usual Hebrew equivalent for *ἔλεος* would be חֶסֶד. One form of this word is the adjective חָסִיד, meaning "good" or "pious" and also used substantively with the meaning "saint." We may conjecture that in the present case the translator had before him the unvocalized word חסדיך. This word may be vocalized in two different ways and two entirely different meanings may be obtained. The translator here evidently read חֲסָדֶיךָ when the context demanded חֲסִידֶיךָ. Had the correct translation been made, we should have in the English: "O God of the fathers, and Lord of thy saints." This is an improvement in at least two respects: first, it supplies sense to the reading of the best mss.; and secondly, it gives us a couplet suggestive of the usual Hebrew parallelism.

That the language is typical of this book may be judged from its occurrence in two other passages of the Book of Wisdom:

ὅτι χάρις καὶ ἔλεος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ (3 9)
ὅτι χάρις καὶ ἔλεος ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ ἐν τοῖς ὁσίοις αὐτοῦ. (4 15)

If it be objected that the plural חסדים is rendered by the singular *ἔλεος*, it is precisely what we have in Is. 63 7, חַסְדֵי יְהוָה, and, LXX, *τὸν ἔλεον Κυρίου*; in Ps. 106 7, אֶת־רֹב חֲסָדֶיךָ and LXX, *τοῦ πλήθους τοῦ ἐλέους σου.*

In Gen. 32 11 the rendering is by another Greek word, but still in the singular number: מִכֹּל הַחֲסָדִים translated *ἀπὸ πάσης δικαιοσύνης.*

9 3 — *καὶ ἐν εὐθύτητι ψυχῆς κρίσιν κρίνῃ.*

"and execute judgment with an upright heart." (AV)
"and execute judgement in uprightness of soul." (RV)

While *εὐθύς* occurs frequently in the LXX and also in this particular Book of Wisdom, generally corresponding to the Hebrew **ישר**, yet this exact expression, *ἐν εὐθύτητι ψυχῆς*, occurs only here in Wisdom.

Wahl (*Clavis*) in connection with this passage refers to Ps. 119 7, the phrase, "I will give thanks unto thee with uprightness of heart," where the Hebrew equivalent of *ἐν εὐθύτητι καρδίας* is **בישר לבב**.

It might be added, in this same connection, that the very common idiom **רָב רִיב**, accounts for the *κρίσιν κρίνῃ*; see, for example, these very same words in Prov. 22 23.

9 9 — *τί ἀρεστὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου.*

"what is pleasing in thine eyes." (RV)

Even Grimm counts this a Hebraism, comparing with it the expression in Gen. 16 10 (evidently a typographical error for 16 6). In 16 6 we find the similar expression *σοι ἀρεστὸν ἦ*, which is a translation of the original **הטוב בעיניך**.

Thackeray does not consider the possibility of finding translation Greek in the Book of Wisdom (see his *Introduction*), yet makes the following comment (p. 43), "As regards the use of *ὀφθαλμός* in phrases like 'to seem good,' or 'to find favor in the eyes (i. e. in the estimation) of someone (**בעיני**) we find the same sort of distinction between the groups of books as elsewhere. The classical *παρά τινι* or other paraphrase is rarely found. As a rule, the Pentateuch with some of the other books render **בעיני** by *ἐναντίον* (or the vernacular *ἐνώπιον*, *ἔναντι*), while the literal rendering *ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς* is reserved for the later historical books (and is unexampled in N. T.)."

Thus, to use Thackeray's own words, we have here a "literal" example of translation Greek, such as we should expect in the later historical books.

The variant (248) reading only tends to confirm the hypothesis of translation from the Hebrew, for it is equally awkward, *ἐνώπιόν σου*.

9 11c — *καὶ φυλάξει με ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτῆς.*

"And she shall guard me *in her glory.*" (RV)

Grimm (p. 187) translated *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ*, "*in ihrem Glanze;*" i. e., with the "brilliance" or "splendor" which characterizes her (cf. Wisdom 7 26, *ἀπαύγασμα γάρ ἐστιν φωτὸς ἀιδίου*), Wisdom will illuminate the path for the one whom she loves, so that he may not go astray.

The AV rendered, "in her power," following the Vulg. "*in sua potentia.*" Goodrick characterizes this translation as the least likely of several possibilities (p. 220), because in the sense of "power" the word *δόξα* is applied only to God (cf. Rom. 6 4, Christ was raised from the dead, *διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός*). Here glory and power are identical, of course. Goodrick finds more likely: (1) "in her brightness," which suggests the reading of Grimm mentioned above; (2) "through her counsel," taking *δόξα* to mean *δόγμα*; (3) "with her good repute," emphasizing the *guarding* by Wisdom's good name rather than the thought of *guiding*. This is the rendering Goodrick includes in his own English translation.

The meaning of *δόξα* in this verse is necessarily ambiguous. If we consider this as a translation from a Hebrew original, there is a possible analogy in Is. 40 6 where *δόξα* is the translation of חֶסֶד. This is not the common use of *δόξα*, but that it is possible is shown here, and the analogy makes the meaning of v. 11c clearer: it is not in this case, *how* wisdom protects, but *why*; that is, because of her loving-kindness. Thus the meaning is "she will protect me in her loving-kindness."

10 1c — *καὶ ἐξείλατο αὐτὸν ἐκ παραπτώματος ἰδίου.*

The word *ἰδίου* is very peculiar here and clearly is not idiomatic Greek. In the AV it was not translated and we have merely the statement that Wisdom "brought him out of his fall." The

reference is to Adam, of course, and since there is no comparison with any one else who has sinned, the literal translation of the RV is clearly no improvement on the sense: "Wisdom guarded to the end the first-formed father of the world that was created alone, And delivered him out of his *own* transgression."

Adam's sin was a serious one and Wisdom alone saved him *from the death penalty*. Similar references to "mortal sin" are to be found in Num. 17 3; Deut. 21 22; 22 26; Hab. 2 10; Prov. 20 2, etc. In the last two citations, the expression in Hebrew is חֲטָא נַפְשׁוֹ (Hab. 2 10, חוֹטֵא נַפְשֶׁךָ; Prov. 20 2, חוֹטֵא נַפְשׁוֹ).

The significance is to be found in the use of the Hebrew word נֶפֶשׁ. With the suffix, נַפְשִׁי, נַפְשְׁךָ, the word is very commonly used in the sense of "self," "I myself," "thou thyself" etc. But the word means "life" and is of course frequently used where life is said or implied to be in danger: Ps. 3 3; 11 1; Is. 3 9; Ps. 7 3; 35 3, 7; 120 6. This is a Hebrew idiom which is ordinarily translated in the LXX by ψυχή. For example, Hab. 2 10 reads in the Greek, καὶ ἐξήμαρτεν ἡ ψυχή σου; while Prov. 20 2 is translated, . . . ἁμαρτάνει εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν. We should translate literally in English with "sinning against" one's own soul (i. e., *life*), which is another way of saying "mortal sin." This Hebrew idiom is hard to translate into either the Greek or the English because these two languages do not have the exact equivalent of נֶפֶשׁ. "Soul" and "life" are not expressed by a single word in the latter languages, while in classical Hebrew, at least, there is no way to express the difference. Assuming that our writer was translating from the Hebrew, the original probably contained the phrase חֲטָא נַפְשׁוֹ, and the troublesome ἰδίου is merely an attempt to express literally in Greek what is a characteristically Hebrew idiom. Thus the meaning of the line is that Wisdom "delivered him from mortal sin."

10 8c — ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀφροσύνης ἀπέλιπον τῷ βίῳ μνημόσυνον.

"But they also left behind them *for* (*human*) *life* (*marg. 'by their lives'*) a monument of their folly." (RV)

The difficulty comes in the phrase τῷ βίῳ. Goodrick (p. 231) suggests that although βίος may mean "human life," yet in this verse and 14 21, τοῦτο ἐγένετο τῷ βίῳ εἰς ἔνεδρον, it may have the meaning of the world at large. In support of this he quotes 4 Macc. 17 14 where we have ὁ κόσμος καὶ ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίος ἐθεώρει, which is not very convincing.

Grimm (p. 199) refers to 4 Macc. 17 19 to show that βίος may bear the meaning „lebende," "the living." This is the sense of the context. The wicked "dying" are contrasted with the righteous "living." In v. 1 Wisdom preserves Adam, and even when he falls does not entirely forsake him. In v. 3 we have a reference to the lot of Cain. The tradition about the punishment of Cain is confused because of God's promise in Gen. 4 15 that he should not be *slain*. Yet, it is the fate of Cain and his posterity to perish utterly. Wisdom preserved the life of Noah (v. 4). V. 5 seems to refer vaguely to Wisdom's care for Abraham. In v. 6 Wisdom saves alive the righteous man Lot, while a pillar of salt testifies to the death of an unbelieving soul, the type of the wicked inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, etc. Thus we clearly have here the contrasted fate of the wicked and the righteous, the dying and the living. This is the sense, but not the ordinary translation of τῷ βίῳ.

Supposing, however, that we have here a translation from Hebrew, the origin of the difficulty is easy to determine. The Hebrew equivalent of βίος is חַיִּים which could mean either "life" or "the living." So the translation of this verse should be:

"But they also left behind them *for the living* a monument of their folly."

10 10 — εὐπόρησεν αὐτὸν ἐν μόχθοις,
καὶ ἐπλήθυνεν τοὺς πόνους αὐτοῦ.

"She prospered him in his toils,
And *multiplied the fruits of his labor*." (RV)

The difficulty in this line does not appear in the English translation. It centers in the word πόνους. Literally, the final clause

of the verse can only be translated, "She multiplied his labors," but it is clear that this cannot be the meaning.

Translators in general have accepted the suggestion of Grimm, who translated "*machte gross seinen Erwerb*," taking πόνους in the sense of the "reward of labor," or "gain." But it is doubtful if it is possible to take this meaning from πόνοι. Liddell and Scott list three main varieties of the word's usage in Greek: (1) work, toil; (2) consequences of toil, in sense of distress, trouble; (3) anything produced by work, in the sense of a work of art. There is nothing here to substantiate the translation of Grimm. He referred to Prov. 3 9 (LXX), for support of his view, which reads,

> τίμα τὸν κύριον ἀπὸ σῶν δικαίων πόνων,
> καὶ ἀπάρχου αὐτῷ ἀπὸ σῶν καρπῶν δικαιοσύνης.

> Honour the Lord with thy substance,
> And with the first fruits of all thine increase. (RV)

This is not decisive, nor are the two verses listed by him in Ecclus. 14 15 and 28 15. The first of these rather suggests the literal meaning of πόνοι:

> οὐχὶ ἑτέρῳ καταλείψεις τοὺς πόνους σου,
> καὶ τοὺς κόπους σου εἰς διαίρεσιν κλήρου.

> "Shalt thou not leave thy labours unto another,
> And thy toils to be divided by lot?" (RV)

Ecclus. 28 15 may be taken either way and is clearly not decisive:

> γλῶσσα τρίτη γυναῖκας ἀνδρείας ἐξέβαλεν,
> καὶ ἐστέρεσεν αὐτὰς τῶν πόνων αὐτῶν.

> "A third person's tongue hath cast out brave women,
> And deprived them of their labours." (RV)

So far as the Wisdom of Solomon is concerned the evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of the literal meaning, "labor," "toil," "pain," or the like, with one exception. The word πόνοι occurs in the following passages: 3 15; 5 1; 8 7, 18; 9 16; 10 9, 10; 15 4; 19 16. Aside from the verse in question, the only case in which there is ambiguity about the meaning is in 8 7,

καὶ εἰ δικαιοσύνην ἀγαπᾷ τις,
οἱ πόνοι ταύτης εἰσὶν ἀρεταί.

The famous list of virtues follows. The RV renders 8 7,

"And if a man loveth righteousness,
The fruits of Wisdom's labour are virtues."

But equal sense is obtained if we translate this passage literally. The tasks which Wisdom sets are σωφροσύνη, φρόνησις, δικαιοσύνη and ἀνδρεία. Such duties as these are glorious duties and might well be described as virtues. Goodrick translates:

"And if a man cherish righteousness,
Her labours are virtues;
For she teacheth temperance and prudence,
Justice and manliness,
Than which nought in life is more profitable to man."

Goodrick himself evidently takes "labours" in the sense of "the fruits of labor," but this is not necessary to the meaning. The tasks Wisdom requires of man are temperance, prudence, justice, and manliness. These in themselves may be considered "labours."

An added difficulty to translators in this passage has been the meaning of the verb used with πόνοι, which is ἐπλήθυνεν. Goodrick finds a dilemma here. Either πόνους means "the fruit of his labours" or the verb ἐπλήθυνεν must mean "made to succeed," or "prospered." But, as we have seen, the first is very uncertain. According to classical usage, ἐπλήθυνεν cannot possibly mean "prospered." Goodrick (p. 233) escapes the dilemma by assuming that " 'Wisdom' is writing in a foreign tongue." But, are we to admit that our writer is not well-versed in the Greek? That is not the evidence throughout the book; quite to the contrary. As Goodrick himself says, "the only true meaning is 'multiplied his toils'." Goodrick himself adopts the translation, "bless with plenty his labours;" but one does not feel he himself is convinced.

Thus we are not able to obtain a satisfactory translation on the basis of the Greek text, without reading into the line the obvious meaning of the context.

Assuming, however, that the writer was translating from the Hebrew, we come to a simple solution of the difficulty. The Hebrew equivalent of *πόνοι* is יְגִיעַ which has two meanings, (1) labor, toil; (2) the product of labor, or better, *the reward*, *gain*. In this usage the word is found in Is. 45 14; 55 2; Jer. 3 24; 20 5; Ps. 109 11; Neh. 5 13; as derived from tillage, Ps. 78 46; Job 39 11; Haggai 1 11; Ps. 128 2.

Thus it appears that our writer, translating from the Hebrew, naturally enough fell upon *πόνοι*, which is the common equivalent of יְגִיעַ in its primary meaning, and which he was regularly using in other passages of his translation. In this particular passage, however, in conjunction with *ἐπλήθυνεν*, the context demands another translation, perhaps *κάρπους*. So the hypothesis of a mistranslation from the Hebrew furnishes the simplest solution of the difficulty in this passage.

III

It remains to discuss the bearing of this evidence upon the division of the book. Several questions naturally arise: How far does the translated part extend? Or, to put it in another way, just where does the originally Greek section begin? Was *all* of the first part originally written in Hebrew?

From the character of this essay it is natural that chief importance should be given to the occurrence of translation-idiom in the Greek text. It is generally admitted that the traces of Hebrew idiom are to be found within the first half of the book. The cases cited in the previous section are scattered throughout the first ten chapters, while what is commonly considered to be a Hebraism is found in the first verse of the eleventh chapter. At the end of this verse there is an abrupt transition in the verbal sequence. V. 1 reads, "She (Wisdom) prospered their works in the hand of the holy prophet," with the verb in the third person singular; while v. 2, with a verb in the third person plural, introduces a new subject, the Israelites, "They went through the wilderness, etc." Furthermore, from this point onward there is a marked

lessening of the parallelism characteristic of the first ten chapters as a whole. For these reasons especially the present writer concludes that the translated material ends with 11 1 and that the Greek original began with 11 2. This division of the book coincides with that of the early critic, Eichhorn, who did not, however, admit the possibility of Hebrew origin for the first part. It is also identical with the major division proposed by Holmes, who concluded that "the difference in style, presentation, and tone between the two parts is undeniable."[27] Holmes balanced the reasons in support of the composition of the book against those for its unity and concluded that the most effective of these had to do with the numerous and striking linguistic differences between the two sections. He demonstrated with a chart the astonishingly different proportion in which certain particles are used in the first and last parts of Wisdom, including the following: *μέν*, *δέ*, *ἵνα*, *ἀλλά* (*μόνον*), *γάρ*, *καὶ γάρ*. The significance of these figures was seized upon by Speiser[28] who maintained that "Holmes' conclusions for considering the first part separately are all in favor of its *Hebrew origin*. The latter will easily explain the paucity of particles, comparatively smaller number of compounds, peculiar distribution of certain words, etc. In fact a non-Greek source of the book is practically *postulated* thereby, and the theory is particularly supported by the fact that—to use Holmes' own argument in a different connection—the support comes *unwittingly*, the author not having considered the possibility of a Hebrew origin."

The division at the end of 11 1 harmonizes well with the opinion of most critics who have touched upon the Hebraisms in the Book of Wisdom, whether or not they have admitted the possibility of a Hebrew original. Grimm[29], for example, listed the following verses as containing Hebraisms: 1 1; 2 9; 2 15; 2 16; 4 13; 4 15; 7 29; 8 4; 8 11; 8 21; 9 3; 9 6; 9 9; 11 1; 13 9; 19 17. It

[27] *Op. cit.*, p. 523.
[28] *Op. cit.*, pp. 478, 479.
[29] *Op. cit.*, Einleitung, "Sprache und Darstellung" (Sect. 3).

will be observed that 14 out of 16 of these Hebraisms fall within the limit designated. Several so-called "half-Hebraisms" mentioned by Grimm all belong within these chapters: 6 3; 6 14 and 9 1. More recently Professor Freudenthal[30] has referred to the "intermingling of stylistic ostentation and poverty" in the Wisdom of Solomon, by "poverty" indicating such Hebraisms as those in 1 1; 2 9; 4 15; 9 1; 9 8; 9 9 and 11 1. It will be observed that these Hebraisms all fall within the first section of the book. The three alleged cases of mistranslation cited by Focke have already been mentioned. Speiser himself has listed mistranslations in the following lines: 1 5; 1 16; 2 5; 2 6; 3 12; 4 12; 4 19; 5 3; 5 12; 8 4; 8 5—6.

In connection with the parallelism reflected in the Greek text, Focke takes issue with the generally accepted point of view. Grimm judged the parallelism to continue through the first ten chapters, in imitation, as he thought, of the Hebrew style of the Psalms, Job and Proverbs. Siegfried (1900) affirmed the same point of view, although in his own translation he used verse form through 12 18, which caused Focke to inquire if we were expected to discover a third form of literary structure in chs. 10 1—12 18. Under the sub-heading, "Poesie und Prosa," Focke[31] claims that the parallelism of the book is limited as follows: in chs. 1—5 it is consistently observed; in 6 1—12 18 the parallelism preponderates with occasional prose; while in 12 19—ch. 19, the prose preponderates with only scattered examples of parallelism. Focke concludes that the author of chs. 6—19 in combining his own work with the original chs. 1—5 which he translated from the Hebrew, was at first consistently but gradually less and less careful to observe his imitation of the Hebrew parallelism. This attempt to limit the genuinely Hebrew parallelism to chs. 1—5 Focke combines with various arguments under the two general headings "Inhalt" and "Form" but inconclusively. For example, Focke points to the comparative absence of the term *Sophia* and

[30] *Op. cit.*, p. 733.
[31] *Op. cit.*, pp. 51ff.

other Greek terminology in chs. 1—5, compared with its frequent usage in chs. 6—19. Even if 1 6 be ruled out of consideration as an interpolation, as Focke insists, it is difficult to agree that "*diese auffällige singulare Erscheinung in den ersten fünf Kapiteln der Sap. völlig fehlt.*"[32] Traces of Greek thought certainly are to be found in the translator's language in 1 7; 2 2 c d; 2 3; 2 23. Thus chs. 1—5 are not free from this terminology. Nor does the usage of *Sophia* at least continue in all of chs. 6—19, occurring only once in these chapters.

A similar inconclusiveness exists in Focke's argument that in Part I as defined by him we find only a stern, judicial deity (1 3; 1 7—10; 4 16; 5 16—20), while in Part II we discover a benevolent, merciful deity.[33] To support his view Focke quotes from the second section: 6 7; 7 26; 11 23 ff; 11 26; 12 1; 12 2; 12 10; 12 11; 12 13; 12 18; 12 20; 12 22; 14 3; 15 1; 16 6; 16 7; 16 8; 16 10; 16 11; 16 21; 16 26; 19 22. It might be said, of course, that the writer is dealing in Part I with a different set of circumstances and a different phase of the nature of God. Even if the difference claimed can be convincingly shown, however, does this show a division between chs. 1—5 and 6—19? As will be observed, only two of the citations mentioned, 6 7 and 7 26, occur before the eleventh chapter. The division might nearly as well be drawn at chapter 11. Focke continues with an attempt to portray contrasting schemes of eschatology in chs. 1—5 and 6—19; and finally to uncover in chs. 1—5 a description of the Pharisees and Sadducees, proving the Palestinian origin of these chapters. One is left, however, with a consciousness of the difficulty of analyzing the book on such grounds, especially in the light of the many different conclusions reached by equally scholarly critics who have followed very similar methods of inquiry. Under the heading, "Form," Focke tabulates among other things the usage of certain particles and on this basis argues for his analysis of the book. It is illuminating, however, to observe that Holmes arrives at

[32] *Op. cit.*, p. 21.
[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 22ff.

a very different solution of the problem on the basis of a study of nearly the identical words classified by Focke. While agreeing with Focke's hypothesis that the translator of the first part of the book is the author of the second, yet it seems difficult to accept his limitation of the Hebrew original to chs. 1—5.

Speiser would credit the first nine chapters to the Hebrew original with the exception of the considerable section 6 22—7 30. He reasons that after 6 21, "O ye kings of the people, honour Wisdom, that you may reign for evermore," the redactor, presumably the translator-author himself, felt the need of certain "explanatory remarks" on the nature of Wisdom.[34] Speiser also mentions, in agreement with Focke, that the parallelism in this part of the book is not sustained, which is a contributing factor to his decision that this section should be omitted from the translated material. While it is possible to maintain, as did the late Professor Gressmann, that certain sentences or longer sections of the first part of the book may originally have been written in the Greek and likewise in the second part that one or more small sections may come originally from the Hebrew, yet any such theory is exceedingly precarious. It has been commonly supposed, for example, that so Greek a passage as the Sorites in 6 17—20 could not have been written in Hebrew, yet it may be pointed out that such step figures do occur in the Rabbinical writings and more than once. So far as the suggestion of Speiser is concerned, it is possible to mention at least one important obstacle in the way of an obvious mistranslation in 7 22, which involves a considerable number of verses. The Greek reads, *ἡ γὰρ πάντων τεχνῖτις ἐδίδαξέν με σοφία*, which is translated, "For Wisdom, which is the worker of all things, taught me." Here Wisdom is made the subject of the verb while in the rest of the same context, God is the subject, stated or understood. V. 17 reads, "For he (God) hath given me certain knowledge of the things that are, etc." God is considered the subject through all the subsequent verses until v. 22 and should clearly be so read

[34] *Op. cit.*, p. 480.

in that verse. The line would then read, "For he (God) taught me wisdom, etc." In this manner the true sense of the passage may be restored. It is the opinion of the writer that with no considerable exceptions the section 1 1—11 1 is translated from the Hebrew.

In conclusion it might be added that we are dealing with the *Wisdom* of Solomon. It would be natural to expect that *Sophia* should be mentioned frequently in such a case throughout the various chapters of the book. It is noteworthy that after 11 1 the word occurs only in one passage, 14 5. Furthermore, it is the Wisdom of *Solomon* with which we are concerned, and in chs. 1 1—11 1 Solomon is given a prominent place. He is described as a king, the son of a king, one who seeks to be worthy of his father's throne (9 12); he speaks repeatedly in the first person; addresses in a tone of authority the "judges of the earth" (1 1) and kings and rulers (ch. 6). But after 11 1 Solomon drops out of sight. Such considerations together with those already mentioned lead one to believe that the original Wisdom of Solomon written in Hebrew extended as far as 11 1 of the present Greek text.

THE PROBLEM OF DEUTERONOMY: A SYMPOSIUM

A

THE CASE FOR THE EARLY DATE OF DEUTERONOMY

JULIUS A. BEWER
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

A truly scientific criticism never stops. No question is ever closed for it. When new facts appear or a new way of understanding old facts is shown, the critic is ready to reexamine, to modify or to overthrow his theory, if it does not account for all the facts in the most satisfactory way. For he is interested in the truth of his theory, and indifferent to the label, old or new; orthodox or heterodox; conservative, liberal or radical, that others may place upon it. There is nothing so exhilarating as the discovery of a fresh way of looking at old problems if it offers a better solution.

Over a century's patient, careful, illumined research had brought us nearer and nearer to the solution of the problem of the Pentateuch until the modern documentary hypothesis had gained almost unanimous assent among critical scholars, at least in its large, fundamental results which Wellhausen formulated and expounded so brilliantly and convincingly. But the work of critical investigation and reexamination has gone on, and in details the hypothesis has been modified. Just now it is not a detail that is challenged, but one of its most important points:

the date and aim of Deuteronomy. The theory had maintained, (1) that in its original form D was composed in the seventh century, whether under Hezekiah or Manasseh or Josiah the critics were not agreed; (2) that it was a reform program in which one of the essential aims, though not the only one, was the centralization of the cult in one sanctuary, the temple at Jerusalem; (3) that it was published in the eighteenth year of King Josiah and that it became the basis of his reformation. Critics who had reexamined D afresh had pointed out that D, as we now have it, is the result of a long literary process in which several older law codes and various editions have a large part. But they had not denied that one of D's principles was the centralization of worship, nor that D was Josiah's lawbook and the basis of his reform. Of late, however, these "assured results of criticism" have been denied and two widely differing theories, one maintaining an earlier and the other a later date for Deuteronomy, have been proposed.

The principal sponsors of the theory, viz., that of an early date, which we are to examine in this paper are Professor Oestreicher in Germany[1] and Professor Welch in Scotland.[2]

Oestreicher maintained (1) that the story of Josiah's reform in 2 Kings 22f. is interested not in the centralization of the cult in Jerusalem but only in its purification from all heathen and especially Assyrian elements both in Jerusalem and elsewhere, not in *Kulteinheit* but in *Kultreinheit*. The abolition of the high places and the bringing of the priests to Jerusalem were temporary measures to be done away with as soon as conditions permitted. Josiah had begun his reformation on his own initiative, as we learn from 2 Chr. 34 3, several years before the law book, consisting of D and other parts of the Pentateuch, was discovered. Oestreicher further maintained (2) that the original D did not demand an absolute centralization of the cult at Jerusalem but

[1] Th. Oestreicher, *Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz*, 1923. See also W. Staerk, *Das Problem des Deuteronomiums. Ein Beitrag zur neuesten Pentateuchkritik*, 1924.

[2] Adam C. Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy. A New Theory of its Origin*, 1924.

only a relative one at several larger sanctuaries. Deut. 12 14, which had always been understood to mean: "take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place thou seest, but in *the* place בַּמָּקוֹם which Yahweh shall choose in *one* of thy tribes בְּאַחַד שְׁבָטֶיךָ," Oestreicher translates: "but in *any* place which Yahweh shall choose in *any one* of thy tribes." According to him D meant exactly the same as Ex. 20 24: "an altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen: in *every* place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee," although here בְּכָל־(הַ)מָּקוֹם is used.

Welch, in his brilliant and fascinating book, came to the same conclusion, that the original D did not demand absolute centralization of worship—this evidently quite independently of Oestreicher, although he published his book a year later. The scope of his investigation is narrower, he did not treat the story of 2 Kings 22f., and confined his investigation to the code of D, i. e. chaps. 12–26. His theory was due to a twofold reaction, against the complicated literary hypothesis which operated with several editions of D,[3] and against the theory that D was the result of Josiah's reformation, the work of impractical dreamers of the exile who, under the influence of the centralization of the cult by Josiah, elaborated a legal system which was incapable of being put into practice at any time.[4] Welch felt that the common fallacy in both sets of theories was the assumption that D demanded the centralization of all worship in one place. For when he set

[3] C. Steuernagel, *Das Deuteronomium übersetzt und erklärt*, [1], 1898, [2], 1923; A. F. Puukko, *Das Deuteronomium*, 1910; J. Hempel, *Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums*, 1914.

[4] G. Hölscher, "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums," *Zeitschr. für alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1923, S. 161–255; "Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen und seine Redaktion" in Gunkel's *Eucharisterion*, 1923, S. 158. How strongly Welch felt the force of Hölscher's arguments is seen, e. g., from this passage: "in spite of its abounding difficulties, it seems to be the conclusion to which we are driven if we retain the view that by the sanctuary where Jahweh elects to locate His name, Deuteronomy means the temple of Jerusalem" (p. 196).

out to discover the controlling principles of the legislators and in particular whether their aim was to enforce centralization of worship or, if it was not theirs, whether it was that of a reviser, he found that neither the original nor the revised laws (if indeed they were revised) had anything to do with centralization, that there was in the whole code only one passage, Deut. 12 1–7, that taught centralization and this was clearly an addition which a later writer had inserted at the beginning of the code in order that the whole law should be read in its light. And this has actually been done ever since. Omit this section and read the rest of the law without the idea of centralization, translating the phrase "*the* place which Yahweh shall choose" ("in *one* of thy tribes" 12 14) by "*any* place which Yahweh shall choose (in *any one* of thy tribes") and interpreting it of any legitimate Yahweh sanctuary,—and you are rid of all the difficulties that face you as long as you think that these laws are intended for a single central sanctuary, and they become quite practical. Then you do not have, e.g., the incredible command that the whole population of the country shall go to Jerusalem at the time of the harvest when an absence of everybody from home would be impossible; then they all had to go simply to the near-by Yahweh sanctuary. The dominating motive behind the code was not the unity but the purity of the cult, or in Oestreicher's phrase, not *Kulteinheit* but *Kultreinheit*. D's whole emphasis was on the character, not the number of the places of worship, for its burden was Yahwism against Baalism, and it was opposed to the indiscriminate use of heathen sanctuaries by the people of Yahweh as well as to casual private sanctuaries like Micah's.

As soon as this is recognized the time in which these laws originated can be definitely determined, for they were addressed to the conditions that prevailed in the early monarchy. "The Deuteronomic code is the outcome and one expression of that religious and national movement which rose in Benjamin and Ephraim, and which in its beginning is associated with the personality of Samuel" (p. 206). It has its "closest relation to the life of Ephraim . . . . . and may be the 'use' of Bethel, or one of

the larger sanctuaries in Ephraim" (p. 191). The law which was framed for this one particular period succeeded in preventing "the people from using indiscriminately the heathen sanctuaries. They never adopted as their own any of the Canaanite shrines" (p. 211). But when "that period with its conditions came to an end .... the legislation drafted to meet them .... fell aside as a working system since its purpose was served ....., (it) was not capable of being adapted to serve a new age" and that is the reason why "it is so singularly free from glosses, explanations and additions" (p. 205, cf. also p. 192). The complicated theories of several editions are therefore quite uncalled for; and on this view the laws of D are, just as we should expect laws to be, altogether practical and well fitted "to form a guide for the actual life of the community" (p. 195) and not the unworkable dream of impracticable dreamers of the exile.

We will consider Welch's form of the theory somewhat carefully. If it is tenable it will have an important bearing on our view of the history of Israel's religion.

The basis on which the whole theory rests is the translation of the words המקום אשר יבחר יהוה באחד שבטיך Deut. 12 14.[5] The natural rendering is the one that has always been given to it, "*the* place which Yahweh shall choose in *one* of thy tribes." How else could this thought be expressed in Hebrew, unless one were to circumscribe it? If the author wanted to say just this in the most direct way without circumlocution he would have to write thus if everybody were to understand his meaning at once. But if he wanted to say "*any* place which Yahweh shall choose in *any* of thy tribes," would he be understood as meaning this and

[5] It is not necessary to refute again in detail Oestreicher's and Welch's translation, since this has been done effectively, e. g., by König, "Stimmen Ex. 20 24 und Dtn. 12 13f. zusammen?" *ZATW*, 1924, pp. 337–346; "Der generelle Artikel im Hebräischen," *ibid.*, 1926, pp. 172–175; Budde, "Das Deuteronomium und die Reform Josias," *ibid.*, 1926, pp. 177–224; Battersby Harford, "Since Wellhausen," *Expositor*, 1925, pp. 323–349; W. C. Graham, "The Modern Controversy about Deuteronomy," *Journ. of Rel.*, 1927, pp. 396–418.

not the other, if he wrote המקום וגו׳? Welch says, yes, and refers to Deut. 19 5 and 23 17, maintaining[6] that while the fugitive manslayer or slave could choose only one of the places of refuge, Yahweh could choose several where he would locate his name. The latter may be true, but if the writer wanted to express in Hebrew "*any* place . . . . . in *any* of thy tribes," he would write בכל־מקום as in Ex. 20 24 and בכל־שבטיך, for else he would be misunderstood. D wrote בַּמָּקוֹם . . . בְּאַחַד שבטיך and as a matter of fact has been understood from the time of Josiah on as meaning just what he wrote: one particular place in one particular tribe.—Of course, if there are cogent reasons for believing that the original author intended to say, "*any* place" etc., we may assume that in every case where the phrase occurs the text has been changed (by the author of the interpolation Deut. 12 1–7?) from an original בכל־מקום "*any* place" or בַּמְּקוֹמוֹת "the places," and in 12 14 בכל־שבטיך "in *any* of thy tribes" or בשבטיך "in thy tribes." But this is only justifiable if it can be shown that the laws are actually impractical or even impossible for a single central sanctuary. That is just what Welch believes and why he interprets (without textual emendation) the phrase as referring to any number of legitimate Yahweh sanctuaries in order to make the laws reasonable and practicable.

The contrast is for Welch between legitimate Yahweh and illegitimate heathen sanctuaries, not between illegitimate local Yahweh sanctuaries[7] and the one legitimate Yahweh temple at Jerusalem. Now it is noteworthy that in the entire code the contrast, *when expressed*, is always between "the place which Yahweh shall choose" etc. and either "thy gates" (= homesteads or home towns) or "every place which thou seest"; never between "the place which Yahweh shall choose" and heathen sanctuaries, *except* in Deut. 12 1–7 which Welch regards as a later interpolation and where he also agrees that "the place" is the one central

[6] In an article on "The Two Descriptions of the Sanctuary in Deuteronomy," *Expos. Times*, 1926, pp. 215–219.

[7] Private shrines such as Micah's may be disregarded at this point.

sanctuary at Jerusalem: Thus according to 16 5 the Passover, and according to 12 17 the tithes and firstlings must now be eaten at the sanctuary, no longer at home, where the tithes of the third year (14 28; 26 12), blemished firstlings (15 22) and non-sacrificial meat (12 15, 21) are still to be consumed. There is no indication in these laws that the Israelites were in the habit of going with their passover, tithes and firstlings to heathen sanctuaries against which they must be warned. Of course, they celebrated the great annual festivals of unleavened bread, weeks, and tabernacles at their sanctuaries, not at home, and in the reformulation of the ancient law of Ex. 23 17; 34 23: "Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before Yahweh thy God," D adds "in the place which he shall choose." What is the implied contrast here? Had it ever been the custom of the Israelites to appear *before Yahweh* at a Baal or Astarte sanctuary, where Baal and Astarte priests functioned, in the naïve belief that they appeared there actually *before Yahweh*? That seems to me credible only if the sanctuaries and the priestly functions at them had been taken over by Israel and their own Yahweh priests.

But Welch denies that Israel ever adopted a Canaanite shrine. If he is right, the differentiation between Israelite and Canaanite sanctuaries must be pronounced. Why then did D not bring out this contrast by saying, "not at any Baal sanctuary"? Was this so self-evident that it needed not to be expressed? One could say this only if Israel had actually celebrated, or were in danger of celebrating, their Yahweh festivals at Baal sanctuaries where Baal priests functioned, so that they understood the implied contrast at once, or if D belonged to the time of the invasion of Canaan when the opposition to the sanctuaries of the hostile Canaanites was universal, that is to a time still earlier than Welch assumes. But neither the one nor the other is at all likely. The early sharp differentiation between Yahweh and Baal places gave way where the Canaanites were dispossessed. Their sanctuaries were used by Israel, they were no longer Baal places but Yahweh's property, for he was now the Baal of the land, and his own people, not Baal priests, officiated there. Where the Canaanites

were not driven out the Baal sanctuaries remained in their possession and there was no Yahweh worship at them. The Yahweh places were distinct from them and in opposition to them. Quite early, however, the Yahweh priests took over from the Canaanites rites which belonged to the agricultural festivals which they adopted from them when they changed from a nomadic to an agricultural mode of life and which they celebrated in honor of Yahweh who as God of the land had become also the giver of agricultural blessings. When the assimilation between Israel and the Canaanites became more complete and Yahweh became the God of the Canaanites too, the Baal sanctuaries with their Baal ritual were appropriated and adapted to Yahweh worship by the Israelite priests and people. This is the syncretistic worship which Hosea and Jeremiah attacked and which, according to the prevailing critical theory, D tried to abolish by centralizing all worship in one place. To them it was not Yahweh but heathen worship, but not to the people who replied, e. g., to the charge of Baalism made by Jeremiah: "I am not defiled, I have not gone after the Baalim" (Jer. 2 23). When they sacrificed "in every place they saw" as D phrases it, or "upon every high hill and under every spreading tree" as Jeremiah says (2 20f., also 2 28; 3 2, 6—13; 11 13; 17 2f.), they meant to honor Yahweh whom they called their Baal (Hos. 2 16). If Welch believes that Israel "never adopted as their own any of the Canaanite shrines" (p. 211) and that "not one of their leading shrines can be proved to have a Canaanite origin" (p. 213), he has not only the analogy from other religions but also the Old Testament prophets and historians against him. For in these latter also there has been retained the memory that some of the later Israelite sanctuaries were already sacred places in the Canaanite period, in spite of the fact that it was in the interest of later writers to eliminate these traces. Thus J tells, "And Abram passed through the land unto *the sanctuary* of Shechem"[8] (Gen. 12 6); E narrates, "And Abraham . . .

[8] מקום שכם is here not simply "the place of Shechem" but, as Welch translates מקום in Deuteronomy, "*the sanctuary* of Shechem," compare v. 7.

went to *the sanctuary* המקום of which God had told him . . . and saw *the sanctuary* afar off and said, . . . I and the lad will go yonder: *and we will worship*" (Gen. 22 3–5), and also "and Jacob . . lighted upon the *sanctuary* בַּמָּקוֹם" (Gen. 28 11). Shechem, Moriah, Bethel were already sanctuaries in pre-Israelite times. So late a writer as Gen. 14 18 says, "And Melchizedek, king of Salem . . . was priest of *El 'elyôn.*" And one wonders whether it is at all likely that Dan, at one of the sources of the Jordan with all its suggestion of a dwelling of a divine being, had no sanctuary before the Danites took it (Judg. 18 27–31). Welch's assertion that Israel never adopted Canaanite shrines is therefore untenable and, as a result, the contrast between "the place which Yahweh chooses" and the heathen sanctuaries, which he assumes, would have had to be expressed if it was meant. The old interpretation which sees here a contrast between the many local Yahweh sanctuaries and the one legitimate central sanctuary is still the most natural; and it is in line with the known facts of the history of the eighth and seventh centuries.

The point where the issue between the common critical theory and Welch's is most clearly joined is in connection with the yearly festivals and especially the passover. According to the common view the passover was transferred from the homes to *the central sanctuary* because all sacrifices should be brought nowhere else but there.[9] According to Welch it was transferred to *any Yahweh sanctuary* in order to withdraw it "from all danger of contamination by heathen practices" and to make sure that it was "observed after strict Israelite ritual" (p. 66). Just in how far "the celebration at home was threatening its peculiar Yahweh characteristics" (p. 69) is not clear; if it means that "the flesh of the paschal lamb" was "treated negligently," that danger was not avoided at the sanctuary either; the later P would not insist so strongly

[9] The centralization of worship in Jerusalem was not an end in itself according to the prevailing theory but a means to an end. The end was the establishment of true and pure Yahweh worship; in other words, *Kulteinheit* was a means to *Kultreinheit.*

on its careful treatment, if there were no need for it even at that time. What the heathen practices of a similar character were, to which the celebration at home was "threatening to assimilate it," Welch does not tell, and into the question whether the Maṣṣoth festival was originally a Canaanite spring festival which was (as is commonly believed) taken over by Israel, he does not go, although he argues strongly for the originality of the maṣṣoth verses, Deut. 16 3aβb4. Was there less danger of adopting Canaanite rites at the sanctuary? Did the presence of Yahweh priests who knew the Yahweh ritual guarantee absolute purity of ritual there? Does not what we know of the cult at the Yahweh sanctuary at Jerusalem, e. g., forbid such an assumption; and do we not have 1 Sam. 2 12—17 for Shiloh, and Hosea 4 6ff. for the character of the priests in general? Moreover, if the reason for the transfer of the passover to the sanctuary was really the guarding of its distinctive Yahweh ritual, it is surprising that nothing is said of the particular feature which had been characteristic of its celebration hitherto: the application of the blood to the lintel and the door-posts of the houses. True enough, after the removal to the sanctuary this became impossible. And yet it had been the most significant feature of the festival and its name *pesaḥ* is explained both by JE (Ex. 12 21—27) and P (Ex. 12 7, 13) as due to Yahweh's "passing over" when he saw the blood. Its complete disregard by one to whom the preservation of the ancient Yahweh ritual was the main motive for the transfer of the passover to the sanctuary, is all the more striking when we find Ezekiel insisting on it, with the modifications, of course, that were necessitated by the altered conditions. Here is one who was deeply interested in the ritual, and he describes a rite which is altogether singular and clearly fashioned after the ancient rite of the passover: on the first day of the first month (= Abib) the priest is to take the blood of a young bullock without blemish and apply it to the door-posts of Yahweh's house and to the posts of the gate of the inner court as well as to the four corners of the ledge of the altar (Ezek. 45 19). Was this Ezekiel's own contribution to the ritual of the passover in the temple? Or may we assume

that it had already been the practice in the days of Josiah? In any case, why did D, *if* his main concern was the preservation of the distinctive Yahweh ritual, say nothing about it?

Welch believes that the one feature of the passover ritual that is emphasized by D, the duration of the festival of a single night and "the command to return at daybreak are precisely the characteristics of the Deuteronomic pesach which must have made it peculiarly difficult or even impossible to observe, when the cult was centralized at Jerusalem" (p. 66). He thinks, with Hölscher, that such a command "never could have been enforced at the temple" (p. 72). Why this was impossible, he does not say. D's interest was, as Welch himself clearly shows, in this, that the celebration should take place in a single night, there was to be no continuation on the next morning, not a scrap of meat was to be left over.[10] D is here simply insisting on the ancient practice, the passover had always been a nocturnal festival which must come to an end before daybreak. That the words, "and thou shalt turn in the morning, and go unto thy tents" (16 7) must be taken as a peremptory command, which could not be enforced at the central sanctuary, rather than as a permission, "thou mayest", is not so certain as Welch makes it to appear. The intention of the law was to insist that at daybreak the festival was at an end. There was nothing more to be done

[10] Welch suggests that the reason for this was the danger of corruption. Was this really so great with boiled meat in the early spring? That this idea was indeed associated with other sacrifices by P we may deduce from Lev. 7 16–18; 19 5–8. D says nothing of it. Originally the "hasty" eating of the paschal lamb which P emphasizes may have been connected with the idea that only while it was still warm its life-power, its *mana*, might be eaten with it. In P (Ex. 12 9) there is a reference to the earliest rite of eating it raw. When Welch says that according to D the observation of the passover must be "hasty" (p. 74), he appears to interpret the sentence, "for thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt in haste" as implying a hasty eating of the passover, whereas it is merely an explanation of why the bread was unleavened. There had been no time to prepare leavened bread, as JE had already explained (Ex. 12 39) when he substituted the historical reason for the one that connected it with nature.

by the worshipper at the sanctuary in the morning. He might therefore go home. The only important matter for him to observe in the morning was that he should not eat any meat that was left over.[11] If he guarded that point there would be no compelling necessity for his return home on that day.[12]

Welch has another argument. "If the law in Deuteronomy is regarded as having ordered the transference of pesach to the temple, both it and the celebration described under Josiah entirely disagree with the legislation which governed the later practice of the returned exiles" (p. 71). What was the later practice? According to the Chronicler (2 Chs. 30 1–27; 35 1–19; Ezr. 6 19–22), Jubilees (49 1 ff.), Josephus (*Ant.*, II 14 6; 15 1, III 10 5; IX 13 2 f.; XI 4 8; *Bell. jud.* VI 9 3), the New Testament, and Pesachim the passover was celebrated at Jerusalem as it had been at Josiah's reformation, and not in the houses of all Israelites, not, as D would say, "within any of thy gates." That is, the practice *did* conform to the law of D in the principal demand which centralized worship in Jerusalem.[13] But how can this practice be reconciled with Ex. 12 1–14 (P), i. e., "the legislation which governed the later practice of the returned exiles?" In point of fact P gives here a description of the first celebration of the passover in Egypt which corresponds with the ancient, pre-Deuteronomic practice,

[11] That there always was the temptation to use any part that had not been eaten is easily intelligible with people who ate meat rarely and to whom it was a delicacy. The law in P insists therefore on a large enough party to dispose of all of it, and if even then something was left, it must be burnt.

[12] The later law understood it so too, cf. Ex. 12 16–18; Lev. 23 6, and accordingly "thy tents" was understood literally, as meaning the tents which they had put up at or near Jerusalem for the festival.

[13] Also in the New Testament the celebration takes place only in Jerusalem. That the paschal lamb was *eaten* in the houses rather than in the temple was a compromise, due to the enormous number of worshippers. But here too D's demand of centralization is carried out. Compare the fine articles by H. Guthe, "Zum Passah der jüdischen Religionsgemeinde," *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1925, pp. 144–171, and "Das Passahfest nach Dtn. 16," in *Graf Baudissin Festschrift*, pp. 217–232.

differing only in the demand that the lamb must be roasted (with fire), not eaten raw or boiled. For P this celebration in Egypt was not a sacrificial festival, for according to him there was no legitimate altar in Egypt and the killing of the lamb could not be a sacrifice nor the meal a sacrificial meal. In describing the first passover in Egypt P does not give the ritual which is to govern post-exilic practice, for according to Ex. 12 14 the passover is not to be celebrated in the homes but at the sanctuary; the fourteenth day of the first month is the "memorial" day "and ye shall keep it as a *ḥag* to Yahweh." That excludes the application of the blood to the door-posts and lintels of the homes of the Israelites which P describes as an important element of the Egyptian celebration. P does not give, therefore, the ritual at the sanctuary which is to govern post-exilic practice here (Ex. 12 1—14). And yet this passage became the official cult legend for the passover which was to be read at the celebration; as it is still read by the Samaritans at their celebration, although the ritual they follow is not that of P but that of D, except in the matter of roasting; for it is celebrated on Mount Gerizim, the place of their ancient sanctuary, with the modifications necessitated by the altered conditions: they now have no sanctuary or altar, the lambs are slaughtered in a ditch. Quite similarly do Christians read the story of the institution when they celebrate the Lord's Supper and believe that it is not only a memorial of the first Communion but a repetition of it, although even the Protestant rite varies considerably from it, e. g., often wafers or cut bread instead of broken bread, grapejuice instead of wine, not one cup but more, even one for each, are used. The Jewish rabbis were quite justified when they differentiated the first passover as the Egyptian passover פסח מצרים from the later passover פסח דורות. Thus in saying that D's law "entirely disagrees with the legislation which governed the later practice of the returned exiles, for according to it Pesach was definitely prescribed as a household ritual at which even a priest is not required to be present," Welch is really arguing against the view of those who believe that P in Ex. 12 gives the ritual of the passover for the later prac-

tice.[14] And so understood there is force in his argument, but it has no force when the real facts of history are recognized. For then it is seen that D did influence the later development profoundly, and especially the centralization of the cult which became an accepted fact after the exile. Far from falling aside as a working system after its time was ended, it really continued in force all along, as the Deuteronomic historians and editors, post-exilic prophets like Malachi, and the later prayers witness.

Unfortunately, Welch does not treat the relation of D to the story of Josiah's reform in 2 Kings 22f., but simply makes the strange statement that the significant points of D's law "are ignored in the account of Josiah's passover, and what is emphasized as present at Josiah's passover is absent from Deuteronomy" (p. 74). Now the only thing that is emphasized as present at Josiah's passover, the new element in this celebration, is that it was celebrated "at Jerusalem." And that is precisely what has been maintained by the ordinary critical theory as the new and important element in D's law! If D was "the book of the law" which caused the reform, the passover was, of course, kept at the king's order, "as it is written in the book of the covenant" (2 Kings 23 21), i. e., in Deut. 16 1ff., and the statement that "there was not kept such a passover since the days of the judges" etc., is in accord with the view that D demanded the centralization of worship at Jerusalem, where now again all the people were gathered together as they had been under Joshua before they settled in their several territories. Now Welch does believe that "in the Josianic reform it was decreed that one form of cult at one holy place through one official priesthood was alone legitimate" (p. 220, cf. also p. 10). Was this due to the book of the law that had been found by Hilkiah? If so, what other book could it be but D? For that is the one book of the law that fights for this. If it was D, did not Josiah and his advisers understand D's phrase "the place which Yahweh shall choose" etc., as demanding the

[14] Compare his article, "On the Method of Celebrating Passover," *ZATW*, 1927, pp. 24–29.

centralization of worship? And was not then, on Welch's own interpretation of the phrase, Deut. 12 1–7 already incorporated in D before 621 B. C.? Well, but then we are back, in the main, upon the old position, that D taught the centralization of worship and that it influenced Josiah in this sense.[15]

Let us be quite clear on this point. It is a fact that after the exile there was only one legitimate sanctuary: at Jerusalem. The reform of Josiah had decreed this. The tradition in 2 Kings 22f. asserts that this had been done on the authority of the just discovered book of the law. There is only one book of the law that fights for this: Deuteronomy. The Deuteronomic author of the books of Kings understood it to mean just this, and the principle of the centralization of worship was operative all through the later history till 70 A.D.; and far from regarding the centralization laws as impracticable, the Jews did actually practice them all the time.

This is as true of the feasts of weeks and of tabernacles as of the passover and of unleavened bread.[16] Welch is much impressed by Hölscher's argument that the demand that everybody should go up to Jerusalem for the three yearly festivals is the impossible idea of impractical dreamers and not of practical legislators who would know that the little children and the domestic animals

[15] In a later article, "When was the worship of Israel centralized at the temple?", *ZATW*, 1925, pp. 250–255, Welch shows that the idea of centralization was earlier than the Judean exile both in the Books of Kings and in Deut. 12 1–7 and maintains afresh that Josiah had something to do with this profound change in the Jewish religion.

[16] We need not go into the question whether the verses, Deut. 16 3a β, b, 4a, which deal with maṣṣoth are an original part of the law or not. That the two festivals were originally separate is admitted. That the use of unleavened bread at both may have been one reason for combining them may be granted. Whether D or somebody else combined them, it is clear that the one who did it made attendance at the sanctuary for the passover celebration obligatory under the ancient rule that all males must appear three times every year at the sanctuary, for the passover became now the introductory day of maṣṣoth.—By the way, Steuernagel does not retain in the second edition of his commentary "the whole of verse 3, where Israel is ordered to eat matzoth during seven days at this period" (p. 67) but only v 3a, "eat no leavened bread with it."

could not be left alone and that the fruit of the harvest needed to be guarded against robbers. But strangely enough this impractical command was actually kept all through post-exilic times. What was possible then, cannot have been incredible and impossible before the exile. Welch's insistence on this argument is all the more surprising, as he believes that Deut. 16 16 is genuine, "three times in a year shall *all thy males* appear before Yahweh thy God in the place which he shall choose." In the light of this the other members of the household may attend, but are not under obligation to do so. Budde[17] has finely shown that such laws are in practice always interpreted in accordance with the physical possibilities.—Welch finds another indication for his theory that D did not demand the centralization of worship in the lack of a fixed date for the festivals. "There is no fixed date because there is no central sanctuary" (p. 80). He is far closer to the facts when he says, "it was centralization that led to the appointment of one common date for the haj." (p. 81). It is quite true that a later time found this necessary. Ezekiel felt the need of a fixed day for the passover[18] and for the feast of tabernacles

[17] *L. c.*, pp. 180ff.

[18] D had insisted on its celebration during the month of Abib, but had left the day open, so that it might apparently be celebrated at any tine during that month. Ezekiel interpreted the phrase את־חדש האביב, ordinarily translated "the month of Abib," as "the new-moon of Abib." It does not seem to me likely that D meant this, for it did not fix definite dates for the other festivals either. But it is linguistically quite possible and Elhorst ("Die deuteronomischen Jahresfeste," *ZATW*, 1924, pp. 136–145) thinks it should be translated thus in Deut. 16 1. Be that as it may, Ezekiel understood it thus and fixed it on the first day of the first month (= Abib); the supplementary celebration for those who had without their fault been unable to keep it on the first he put on the seventh day of the first month. When later the date for the passover was fixed on the fourteenth day (Nu. 9 3P), a corrector put that date into Ezek. 45 21, thereby causing much confusion in the whole passage. The supplementary festival was put a month later by P (Nu. 9 1–14). Ezek. 45 21 read originally simply: "the passover shall be to you a *ḥag*," without the date. MT connects חג wrongly with the following שבעות which it points שְׁבָעוֹת "feast of weeks," since it missed that festival in the list. The following shows that it must be read שִׁבְעַת "*seven* days shall unleavened bread be eaten."

(Ezek. 45 18, 25). And so did P who, however, fixed the date of the passover differently.[19] But that does not involve that the Deuteronomic reformers should have drawn that conclusion in their program when they demanded the centralization of the cult. The need of it developed after the centralization had been introduced. The lack of fixed dates can therefore not be used as an argument against centralization in D.

The arguments for the early date of D cannot be sustained at the most significant points, and the whole theory breaks down therewith. We cannot go into a careful examination of the rest of the argument. But even if Welch should succeed in proving an early historical background for some of the laws, that would not affect the matter, because it has long been recognized that D contains older material; this may be even older than had been thought heretofore. The ordinary critical theory has not been destroyed[20]: its foundation appears to be still sound and strong.[21]

The stress Ezekiel lays on the *ḥag* in connection with the passover, as does P likewise (Ex. 12 14), suggests that the *ḥag* was not something that could be taken for granted, as something that had been practiced from olden times. Again, the strong insistence of P, under threat of the severest penalty, on the fourteenth day as the day of celebration suggests that this was an innovation which was not observed by all "at the appointed time" (Nu. 9 13).

Welch maintains (cf. *ZATW*, 1927, pp. 24–29) that D's passover law originated in Northern Israel where it was celebrated as a *ḥag*, and that Josiah extended the North Israelite practice over the whole kingdom, so that in his day pesach was made part of the hag of maṣṣoth and celebrated at the temple for the first time in the history of the nation. But he has adduced no cogent reason for believing that the ḥag celebration of pesach was a northern practice. If the present text in Ex. 34 25 is not due to a later interpolator, it is the *Judean* code that speaks of it as a *ḥag*, while the *Ephraimitic* code does not mention it at all in its parallel law, Ex. 23 18.

[19] On the full moon instead of on the new moon of the first month (= Abib), Lev. 23 5; Nu. 28 16.

[20] This is my conviction also with reference to the attack upon it by Hölscher *et al.*

[21] Welch's book is extremely stimulating and contains many valuable suggestions which will doubtless bear fruit, although his main thesis is not established.

B

THE CASE FOR THE POST-EXILIC ORIGIN OF DEUTERONOMY

LEWIS BAYLES PATON
HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE first advocate of a post-exilic date for Deuteronomy, so far as I know, was C. P. W. Gramberg in 1829.[1] He was followed in 1835 by W. Vatke,[2] and in 1876 by L. Seinecke.[3] Certain French critics of the school of Edouard Reuss, namely, G. D'Eichtal (1886),[4] M. Vernes (1887),[5] L. Horst (1887)[6] came to similar conclusions. A German ally also appeared in S. A. Fries (1903).[7] In England the theory of the late date of Deuteronomy was first proposed by J. Cullen (1903)[8] and R. H. Kennett (1906).[9] None of these works attracted much attention at the time of their

[1] *Kritische Geschichte der Religionsideen des Alten Testaments*, pp. xxvi, 153ff., 305ff.

[2] *Die Religion des Alten Testamentes*, i, pp. 504ff.

[3] *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i, pp. 386ff.

[4] *Mélanges de critique biblique.*

[5] *Une nouvelle hypothèse sur la composition du deutéronome*; *Précis d'histoire juive.*

[6] "Études sur le deutéronome," *Revue de l'histoire des religions*: xvi, 28ff.; xvii, 1f.; xviii, 320ff.; xxiii, 184ff.; xxvii, 119ff.

[7] *Die Gesetzesschrift des Königs Josias.*

[8] *The Book of the Covenant in Moab.*

[9] "The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood," *Journal of Theological Studies*, vi, 1905, pp. 161–186; vii, 1906, pp. 620–624; "The Date of Deuteronomy," *Journal of Theological Studies*, vii, 1906, pp. 481–500.

publication, and they exerted no influence upon general critical opinion.

The modern phase of the post-exilic theory of Deuteronomy begins in 1920 with G. R. Berry's article on "The Code found in the Temple,"[10] and R. H. Kennett's work on *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*. In 1922 G. Hölscher published an elaborate article entitled "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums."[11] He begins by determining the limits of *Urdeuteronomium*, in substantial agreement with Steuernagel and Hempel. As to the date of *Urdeuteronomium*, he remarks: "It grows more and more difficult to regard Deuteronomy as a law-book from the time of Josiah, or from any period of the pre-exilic age, much less as an authoritative and officially recognized law-code introduced into the pre-exilic kingdom of Judah."[12] "Deuteronomy originated in the same priestly circles which later showed themselves hostile to Nehemiah . . . It was no officially introduced law-book, but a program of reform prepared under priestly auspices."[13] In 1923 Friedrich Horst published an article entitled "Die Anfänge des Propheten Jeremia,"[14] and another entitled "Die Kultusreform des Königs Josia,"[15] in both of which he enthusiastically supported Hölscher's theory of the post-exilic origin of Deuteronomy. "Hölscher," he says, "on the basis of the study of Deuteronomy itself, has recently propounded the thesis that Deuteronomy was not produced before 500, and practically was never put into operation. The great advantages of this theory for the understanding of the last stages of the Israelite religion and of the beginnings of Judaism are obvious."[16]

These newer discussions have attracted considerable attention, and have received favorable notice from a number of critics,

[10] "The Code Found in the Temple," *JBL*, xxxix, 1920, pp. 44–51.
[11] *ZATW*, xl, 1922, pp. 161–255.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 182.
[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 252f.
[14] *ZATW*, xli, 1923, pp. 94–153.
[15] *ZDMG*, lxxvii, 1923, pp. 220–238.
[16] *ZDMG*, lxxvii, 1923, p. 226.

such as Burkitt[17] and Spiegelberg.[18] On the other hand, they have called forth vigorous opposition from Freed,[19] Hans Schmidt,[20] Caspari,[21] Eissfeldt,[22] Gressmann,[23] König,[24] Elhorst,[25] Sellin,[26] Nowack,[27] Budde,[28] J. M. P. Smith,[29] and W. L. Graham.[30] The debate is being carried on with great zeal in both camps, so that it is fair to say that at the present moment the problem of the date of Deuteronomy is a very live question.

From the nature of the case this theory assumes the form of a polemic against the current view that Deuteronomy was written in the seventh century B. C. This view, which has prevailed ever since De Wette's *Dissertatio Critica* in 1805, rests upon four main arguments: (a) Deuteronomy was unknown to the literature, or to the religious practice of Israel, before the time of Josiah; (b) Deuteronomy was the code found in the Temple that was the basis of Josiah's reformation; (c) Deuteronomy was known to Jeremiah, and to other writers after the time of Josiah; (d) the internal evidence shows that the code was written in the seventh century.

[17] "The Code found in the Temple," *JBL*, xl, 1921, pp. 166f.

[18] "Zur Datierung des Deuteronomiums," *OLZ*, xxvi, 1923, col. 481f.

[19] "The Code Spoken of in II Kings 22–23," *JBL*, xl, 1921, pp. 76–80.

[20] Review of Hölscher, *Th. Blätter*, ii, 1923, col. 223ff.; *TLZ*, xlviii, 1923, cols. 289–292.

[21] "Weltreichbegebenheiten bei dem Deuteronomisten?" *OLZ*, xxvii, 1924, cols. 8–10.

[22] Review of Horst, "Kultusreform," und "Anfänge des Propheten Jeremia," *TLZ*, xlix, 1924, cols. 224f.

[23] "Josia und das Deuteronomium," *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, pp. 313—337.

[24] "Stimmen Ex. 20, 24 und Dtn. 12, 13f. zusammen?" *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, pp. 337–346.

[25] "Die Deuteronomischen Jahresfeste," *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, pp. 136–145.

[26] *Geschichte des jüdisch-israelitischen Volkes*, i, 1924, pp. 282ff.

[27] "Deuteronomium und Regum," *Festschrift für Marti, Beiheft zur ZATW*, xli, 1925, pp. 221–231.

[28] "Das Deuteronomium und die Reform König Josias," *ZATW*, xliv, 1926, pp. 177–224.

[29] "The Recent History of Old Testament Interpretation," *Jour. Rel.*, vi, 1926, pp. 403–424.

[30] "The Modern Controversy about Deuteronomy," *Jour. Rel.*, vii, 1927, pp. 396–418.

Let us now consider in some detail the ways in which these four main arguments for the current theory of the age of Deuteronomy are treated by the school of Gramberg.

a) **Ignorance of Deuteronomy before the Time of Josiah.**—This argument is, of course, accepted by advocates of the late date, only they claim that ignorance of Deuteronomy continued down to the time of Nehemiah.

b) **Deuteronomy was the Basis of Josiah's Reformation.**—2 Ki. 22–23 records that a book was found in the Temple in the eighteenth year of Josiah. This was endorsed by the prophetess Huldah, and was made the basis of a thoroughgoing reformation undertaken by Josiah. Some twenty-six clues are given as to the contents of this law-book. These show close correspondence with Deuteronomy, and with Deuteronomy only:

	2 Kings	Deuteronomy
Book of the Torah	22 8, 11	17 18; etc.
Covenant	23 2, 3, 21	17 2; 28 69; etc.
Torah of Moses	23 25	1 5; 31 9; etc.
Words of the book	22 13, 16	31 24
Worship Yahweh only	22 17a; 23 3	5 6; 6 4; etc.
Keep commandments	23 3	11 1; 13 6
With heart and soul	23 3	13 4; etc.
Hearken to words	22 13	18 19; etc.
No foreign gods	22 17b; 23 4, 13	6 14; 8 19; 11 28; etc.
No star-worship	23 4, 5, 11, 12	4 19; 17 3
No Canaanite gods	23 5b, 8b, 10	7 16
No high places	23 5a, 8a, 13	7 5; 12 2
No idols	23 24	7 5, 25; 12 3
No standing stones	23 14	7 5; 12 3
No Asherim	23 6, 14	7 5; 12 3
No necromancy	23 24	18 11b
No child-sacrifice	23 10	12 31; 18 10
No temple-prostitutes	23 7	23 17f.
Central sanctuary	23 5a, 8, 13, 15, 19, 23	12 5–14; etc.
Priests of high places	23 8a, 9	18 6–8
Passover	23 21–23	16 5–7
Wrath kindled	22 13, 17	11 17
Curses written	22 13	29 20

Bring evil	22 16	31 17, 21, 29a
Provoke anger	22 17	31 29b
Astonishment, curse	22 19	28 37

This comparison makes it certain, if we accept the narrative of Kings as it now stands, that Josiah's book was Deuteronomy. This identification is the cornerstone of De Wette's theory of the date of this book.

It is generally conceded by the school of Gramberg that the editor of Kings intended to represent Josiah's reformation as based on Deuteronomy. As Seinecke remarks: "It is almost universally assumed that Josiah's book was Deuteronomy; and, according to the conception and statements of the Second Book of Kings, no other book is meant."[31] Hölscher patronizingly remarks: "From the point of view of the Old Testament science of the nineteenth century the proof of this theory seemed quite obvious. The reforms of Josiah can be explained for the most part by the laws of Deuteronomy; and part of them can be explained only by Deuteronomy, particularly the law commanding the destruction of the high places (Dt. 12; 2 Ki. 23 8, 16)."[32] F. Horst also admits: "As a matter of fact it is difficult to deny that the narrative of this reform, as we find it in the respective two chapters of the Book of Kings, unconditionally demands the equation of the law-book there mentioned with Deuteronomy."[33] Advocates of the post-exilic date of Deuteronomy are forced therefore to assert that the account of Josiah's reforms in Second Kings is historically untrustworthy.

(1) *Rejection of the Entire Narrative of* 2 *Kings* 22–23.—The French school of D'Eichtal, Vernes, and L. Horst rejects the whole account of 2 Ki. 22–23 as an invention of the Deuteronomic editor of Kings. They argue that we do not trust the Deuteronomic farewell address of David,[34] nor Solomon's Deuteronomic prayer,[35]

[31] *Geschichte*, i, p. 386.
[32] *ZATW*, xl, 1923, p. 231.
[33] *ZDMG*, lxxvii, 1923, p. 221.
[34] 1 Ki. 2 2–4.
[35] 1 Ki. 8 14–53.

nor Hezekiah's removal of the high places:[36] why then should we trust this Deuteronomic account of Josiah's reformation? The whole story is a fiction of the editor of Kings, designed to represent Deuteronomy as a pre-exilic code, sanctioned by the prophets, and introduced by King Josiah. No book was discovered, and no reformation was undertaken.

This drastic treatment of 2 Ki. 22–23 has the merit of self-consistency in the rejection of all the passages in Kings that show knowledge of Deuteronomy, but it is open to the objection that these particular chapters as a whole show the marks of historical credibility. Hölscher himself concedes: "It must be admitted at the outset that this narrative in its essential elements has extraordinary historical value. This is shown by details which cannot have been invented: the exact dating of the events, all the exact names of the royal officials, the prophetess and her husband, the governor of the city and the eunuchs, and all the extraordinary forms of worship that Josiah removed, such as the high places of the satyrs, the horses of the sun, and the chariot of the sun. If a genuine historical tradition is not found here, then such a tradition is not to be found anywhere."[37]

(2) *Documentary Analysis of these Chapters.*—German and English critics who maintain the post-exilic origin of Deuteronomy differ from the French school in regarding the main features of the narrative of Kings as historical. They accept the finding of a book, its endorsement by Huldah, and the reformation on the basis of its teaching; but they deny that this book was Deuteronomy. They accept the reforms that were aimed at foreign heathenism as derived from an old record; but claim that these were not based on Deuteronomy, but on the Prophets, who, like Deuteronomy, condemned alien gods and their cults. Only the three reforms that are characteristically Deuteronomic, namely, the breaking down of the high places, the bringing up of the priests of the high places to Jerusalem, and the centralized Passover at

[36] 2 Ki. 18 4.

[37] *Festschrift für Gunkel*, p. 208f.

Jerusalem, they reject as additions made by the editor of Kings who wished to identify the book found by Josiah with Deuteronomy. Thus Seinecke remarks: "The Book of Kings in the interest of Deuteronomy makes the prophecy (of Huldah) speak also of 'all the words of the law' . . . The narrative of Kings is here remodeled to adapt it to the views of a later age."[38] Similarly Kennett says: "The account of Josiah's reforms was in all probability not written for a considerable time after the events recorded. If in the meanwhile Deuteronomy had become the law of the community, the historian's account of what Josiah did would naturally be coloured by his conception of what a pious king ought to do."[39] "Arguing from the account contained in 2 Kings xxii. xxiii, many people have concluded that it was the Book of Deuteronomy itself which was read before Josiah. It may indeed be conceded that the writer (or writers) of these chapters was acquainted with Deuteronomy, and that he supposed Josiah to have been familiar with it also; but even the most trustworthy chapters of the Book of Kings are not to be treated as though they were taken from the file of some Jerusalem newspaper . . . The historian himself looked back (xxiii 25ff.) not only to Josiah's successors on the throne, but also to the captivity. If therefore his statements are not those of an eye-witness, but of one who lived at least thirty-five years after the events of 621 B. C., and quite possibly considerably later, there is no difficulty in supposing that his account of Josiah's reign, although based upon a sound tradition, has been coloured by the belief that Josiah as a pious king must have acted in accordance with the Deuteronomic law."[40]

The earlier foes of the credibility of 2 Ki. 22—23 were satisfied with the theory that the specifically Deuteronomic features of these chapters were due to retouching by the editor of Kings, but the recent discussions of Hölscher and Horst are more thoroughgoing.

[38] *Op. cit.*, p. 387.
[39] *JTS*, vii, 1906, p. 491.
[40] *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, 1920, pp. 3f.

Hölscher begins by eliminating a number of verses in these chapters as interpolations by Rd 2, the very latest editor of the Book of Kings, who lived long after Nehemiah. The remainder he analyzes into two distinct documents: the first a non-Deuteronomic source, which knows nothing of the destruction of the high places, or of the centralization of sacrifice at Jerusalem; but only the removal of Canaanite and Assyrian heathenism from the Temple. This source, strange to say, he identifies with E in the Hexateuch and in the other historical books, and claims that it was written after the fall of Jerusalem. The remainder of the narrative in 23 8a, 9—10, 15, 21—27 he ascribes to Rd who lived after 500 B. C. "These verses," he says, "contain a wholly unhistorical account of the destruction of the high places, the bringing of their priests to Jerusalem, and the celebration of a centralized Passover in Jerusalem."[41]

Hölscher's main argument for rejecting 23 8a, 9 is that they interrupt the context.[42] The neighboring verses 6, 7, 8b, 11—12 narrate only the removal of Canaanite and Assyrian heathenism from Jerusalem. These verses narrate the defiling of the high places outside of Jerusalem, and the bringing up of the priests of the high places to Jerusalem. It must be admitted that the order in these verses is bad. Verse 7 belongs logically with 8b and the two read: "And he brake down the houses of the temple-prostitutes[43] that were in the house of Yahweh, where the women wove בתים (?) for the Asherah . . . And he brake down the high places of the satyrs,[44] which were at the entrance of the gate of Joshua, the governor of the city, which were on the left of one entering the gate of the city." Verses 8a and 9 belong logically together and read: "And he brought all the priests out of the cities of Judah, and he defiled the high places where the priests had burned sacrifices from Geba to Beersheba . . . Nevertheless

[41] "Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen und seine Redaction," *Eucharisterion, Festschrift für Gunkel,* 1923, pp. 198–213.

[42] *Op. cit.,* p. 209.

[43] Read הקדשות instead of הקדשים.

[44] Read השערים instead of השערים.

the priests of the high places came not up to the altar of Yahweh in Jerusalem; but they did eat their dues[45] in the midst of their brethren." This lack of order, however, by no means indicates that the defiling of the high places and the removal of their priests are interpolated. The removal of the high places of the satyrs in 8b might equally well be interpolated between 8a and 9. Hans Schmidt makes the interesting suggestion that 8b was accidentally omitted by a copyist after 7 on account of the similar beginning, "and he brake down," and then was inserted after the writing of 8a.[46] Similar dislocations are common in the text of the Old Testament (cf. Isa. 22 3; 31 4f.; Ps. 87). Even after the elimination of 8a, 9 perfect logical order is not secured. Verses 4—6 treat of the removal of Assyrian astral religion, and verses 11—12 return to this subject, but between these stands the removal of Canaanite heathenism in verses 7—10. The fact is, that we have no reason to expect perfect arrangement in excerpts from temple-chronicles which jotted down events in the order of occurrence rather than in the order of logic.

That 8a and 9 differ from the context in going outside of Jerusalem is also not apparent. The sole purpose of these verses is to narrate how the priests of the high places were brought into Jerusalem, and how this affected the Temple-worship. Moreover, the destruction of the high places of the satyrs in 8b, which Hölscher accepts, carries us outside of the walls of Jerusalem.

A further objection to these verses urged by Hölscher[47] is that the treatment of the country priests by Josiah (2 Ki. 23 9) does not correspond with the command in Dt. 18 6—8. In Deuteronomy the Levites from the abolished high places are to be allowed to minister at the altar in Jerusalem, and to receive their portions of the sacrifices; but in Kings they are not allowed to minister at the altar, although they receive the portions. The inference is that Josiah's law-book was not Deuteronomy. It is hard to

[45] Read perhaps מִצְוֹת instead of מִצּוֹת.
[46] *TLZ*, xlviii, 1923, col. 290.
[47] *ZATW*, xl, 1922, p. 202.

see how this argument fits into Hölscher's general conception. He holds that 2 Ki. 23 8a, 9 were interpolated by Rd to represent Deuteronomy as in operation in the time of Josiah, and that they are historically worthless. But, if Rd wished to identify Josiah's book with Deuteronomy, why did he not report exact obedience to the law on Josiah's part?

On the other hand, if the statements of Rd are untrustworthy, how can they be used to prove that Josiah's book was not Deuteronomy? The fact is, that Deuteronomy contemplated only occasional visits of the country Levites to Jerusalem, on which occasions they were to be allowed to minister at the altar of the Temple; but Josiah, in order to break up the high places more effectually, adopted the drastic policy of bringing up all their priests to Jerusalem. This raised practical difficulties, and perhaps the opposition of the Zadokite priests in Jerusalem, which prevented admission of the country Levites to ministering at the Temple-altar. The language of 2 Ki. 23 9 implies, however, that this was in violation of their rights: "Nevertheless, the priests of the high places came not up to the altar of Yahweh in Jerusalem, although they ate their dues (?) among their brethren." This indicates clearly that the country Levites had a legal right to minister as well as to eat of the sacrifices. In other words, the passage implies a law like that in Dt. 18 6–8. As Hans Schmidt aptly observes, "if Dt. 18 6 were not in existence, one would simply have to invent it as the presupposition of 2 Ki. 23 9."[48]

The account of Josiah's centralized Passover in 2 Ki. 23 21–23 is assigned by Hölscher to Rd because of the mention of "this book of the covenant" in 21 and of the "Judges" in 22.[49] In other words, the passage must be late because it shows unmistakable knowledge of Deuteronomy. This is simply begging the question.

Hölscher's linguistic argument for assigning the Deuteronomic verses to a later hand than the body of the narrative is found

[48] *TLZ*, xlviii, 1923, col. 291; cf. H. Gressmann, *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, pp. 328f.; K. Budde, *ZATW*, xliv, 1926, pp. 197f., 200–204.

[49] *Festschrift für Gunkel*, p. 209n.

in their use of Waw connective with the perfect instead of Waw consecutive with the imperfect.[50] It is true that this construction occurs in several verses that Hölscher assigns to the later hands, but it is not found in 23 8a, the account of the defiling of the high places, which Hölscher gives to Rd; and it is found in 23 8b, the narrative of the destruction of the high places of the satyrs, which Hölscher assigns to E. The one word ונתץ Hölscher takes out of 8b and gives to Rd. Evidently this is not a safe criterion for literary analysis.[51]

Horst, who is equally anxious with Hölscher to remove the witness to Deuteronomy from 2 Ki. 22–23, recognizes the objections to Hölscher's method. "One difficulty," he says, "stands in the way of Hölscher's thesis, the account of 2 Ki. 22–23 with its alleged discovery of Deuteronomy in the year 621. Hölscher's own solution of this difficulty, as he has already outlined it, and will soon present more fully, seems, judging from his brief statements, quite inconclusive."[52]

Horst's own astonishing solution of the problem is, that 2 Ki. 22–23 is composed out of the same two documents that are used in the composition of the Book of Jeremiah. He gives no complete table of the fractions of verses that are to be assigned to each of these sources, but contents himself with a summary of the contents of each. Source A narrates that a book was found in the Temple and brought to Josiah. He appealed to the Prophetess Huldah for advice, and she endorsed the book. "From this recension," says Horst, "no one can hit upon the idea that the book found was a law-code . . . In accordance with the entire character of the prophetic writer A, one can think of nothing else than a prophetic book that came into the hands of the king, and made a tremendous impression upon him. . . . The king then went with the inhabitants of Jerusalem into the Temple. There he made a covenant before Yahweh, to walk after Yahweh and

[50] 2 Ki. 23, see Hölscher, *op. cit.*, pp. 209f.

[51] See H. Schmidt, *TLZ*, xlviii, 1923, col. 291; Gressmann, *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, p. 317 n. 2.

[52] *ZDMG*, lxxvii, 1923, p. 226.

to keep His commandments . . . The covenant is certainly never regarded by this source as a code of legally fixed enactments. The content of the covenant made by Josiah is described as 'to walk after Yahweh and to keep his commandments.' If that was the content of Josiah's covenant, then we are not at all surprised to find that in the account of the king's reformation of the cult that follows immediately in the text nothing more can be claimed with certainty linguistically for A. Only a primitive construction of verse 4 may be assigned to it: 'The King commanded the 'priest' (*sic*) Hilqia and the (!) second priest to bring forth out of the Temple the objects that were made for the Baʿal and the Astarte, and to burn them in the Valley of Kidron.' If any one wishes to call that a cult-reformation of Josiah, he is welcome to do so. In my opinion, this older source tells us nothing more about it."[53]

All the rest of the narrative which tells how Josiah carried out a reformation on the basis of Deuteronomy comes, according to Horst, from the late and historically untrustworthy source B. In other words, Josiah's book contained only threats, his covenant was only a general promise to be good, and he undertook no reformation. "This analysis of the sources," as Horst naïvely remarks, "has many advantages. First, it solves simply all the hitherto existing difficulties of a linguistic textual character. Further, all the unpleasant conclusions from the older treatment fall away at once. Chiefly, one comes in this way to agreement with the thesis, established by other considerations, especially those derived from Jeremiah, of the post-exilic origin of Deuteronomy."[54]

In opposition to this argument it may be said: (1) it depends on an analysis of Jeremiah which is in the highest degree problematic; (2) it makes the very improbable assumption that the same documents are used in a poetic prophetic book and in a prose history; (3) the alleged linguistic evidence consists of common words, such as "because," "in order that," "only," "city," "sacri-

[53] *Op. cit.*, pp. 233ff.
[54] *Op. cit.*, p. 238.

fice," that prove nothing; (4) the older source produced by this analysis narrated the finding of a book without contents, the establishing of a covenant without meaning, and the carrying through of a reformation without results. Horst has been disposed of so thoroughly by Gressmann[55] that there is no reason to discuss his argument further.

The fact is, that all attempts to eliminate Deuteronomy from 2 Ki. 22–23 by documentary analysis are artificial. Apart from certain minor glosses, the chapters are a literary unity, and must stand or fall as a whole. One cannot accept the finding of the book and the bulk of Josiah's reforms as historical, and reject the centralization of the cult, merely because this particular element cannot be explained except on the basis of Deuteronomy. Even those reforms of Josiah which do not involve centralization are just as Deuteronomic as are the reforms designed to accomplish centralization. The Prophets from Amos to Micah, of course, condemned foreign religion, but they did not specify the kinds of heathenism, particularly the forms of Assyrian star-worship, that were removed by Josiah. These reforms find an explicit basis only in the legislation of Deuteronomy. It is illogical to deny that these reforms were caused by the publication of Deuteronomy, because they do not mention centralization; and to base on Deuteronomy the removal of the high places, the bringing up of the priests, and the keeping of the Passover, because they do mention centralization. As Budde remarks: "I must in a word declare my opinion that the cutting out of an E narrative from the story of Josiah, as well as the assignment of E to the post-exilic period seems to me dubious in the highest degree; and that the proofs of this theory are entirely lacking. From the time of Manasseh onward the school of Deuteronomy writes not only the frame but also the contents of the narrative."[56]

(3) *Non-Observance of Deuteronomy after Josiah's Reformation.*—In addition to the literary argument just discussed against the

[55] *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, pp. 316–321.
[56] *ZATW*, xliv, 1926, pp. 191f.

credibility of the narrative of centralization in 2 Ki. 22–23, advocates of the late date of Deuteronomy adduce also the historical argument, that Josiah cannot have centralized worship at Jerusalem because the high places continued to exist after his time. The prophecies of Jeremiah, the legislation of the Holiness Code in Lev. 17, and the denunciations of Ezekiel, show that the high places continued to flourish in spite of their reported abolition. The Jews in Elephantine, it is said, knew nothing of Deuteronomy, or of its adoption in the time of Josiah, since they built a temple of Yahu in their city in violation of the Deuteronomic law of the central sanctuary. They stood in close relations with the Jews of Palestine; and must have known Deuteronomy, if it had been in existence.[57]

In reply it may be said, Hölscher admits that Canaanite and Assyrian heathenism were removed by Josiah, yet Ezek. 8–11 shows that it was all back again within a few years. If foreign idolatry and star-worship could be introduced again so easily after their removal, how much more readily could the ancient legitimate sanctuaries of Yahweh be restored. Drastic reforms do not at once win universal recognition. Ancient religious ways persist with extraordinary tenacity. If the author of Kings were to visit modern Palestine, he would still have occasion to lament: "Nevertheless, the high places are not taken away, the people still sacrifice and burn offerings in the high places." In spite of the teachings of Judaism, Christianity, Muhammadanism, the high places still exist in rural Palestine, and we may well believe that they survived Josiah's first attempt to extirpate them. History also shows us a good reason for their speedy return. The young king who had carried through the reformation met a premature death in battle with Pharaoh Necoh at Megiddo (2 Ki. 23 29), and this was popularly interpreted as a sign that Yahweh disapproved of the abolition of the high places, and that the best policy was to restore them as rapidly as possible.

[57] Hölscher, *ZATW*, xl, 1922, pp. 228, 253f.

The Jews at Elephantine violated not only the law of the central sanctuary, but also the law of the sole worship of Yahweh. Alongside of Yahweh they worshiped two goddesses, Ashima-bethel and 'Anath-bethel, besides the oath-god Masgeda and the fetish stone Ḥaram-bethel. Even the Egyptian god Sati is once invoked. If this indicates that Deuteronomy was not in existence, it indicates also that the Decalogue of J in Ex. 34 and E's Book of the Covenant in Ex. 20 23–23 33 were not in existence, to say nothing of the teaching of all the prophets from Moses onward. One might just as well argue that the Jews of Leontopolis did not know Deuteronomy because Onias IV built there a temple of Yahweh about 154 B. C., or that there is no Eighteenth Amendment or Volstead Act because prohibition is not perfectly enforced in the United States. The argument from non-observance is valid only when the non-observance is complete. It is legitimate to argue from the complete non-observance of Deuteronomy before the time of Josiah by prophets, priests, kings, and all the best men of the nation, that Deuteronomy was not in existence; but it is not legitimate to argue from the partial non-observance of the law of centralization after the time of Josiah that Deuteronomy was not in existence.

(4) *Evidence of the Historical Character of the Narrative of the Centralization of the Cult in* 2 *Ki.* 22–23.—Granted that 2 Ki. 22–23 comes from the hand of the editor of Kings, this is no reason for doubting its credibility. The latest event mentioned by Kings is the release of Jehoiachin from prison by Amel-Marduk, King of Babylon, in 560 B. C.[58] There is not a hint in this book of any release of the Jews from exile, of a return to Jerusalem, of a rebuilding of the Temple, or of a restoration of the Jewish community. Kings is a history of the decline and fall of the Israelite commonwealth, and not a ray of hope lights up the gloom. This shows that the composition of the book cannot be assigned to a date after 500 B. C., as Hölscher proposes, but that it belongs to the period of the exile before the rise of Cyrus awakened the

[58] 2 Ki. 25 27–30.

anticipations of restoration cherished by Deutero-Isaiah and his contemporaries. This was not more than sixty years after the events recorded in 2 Ki. 22–23. This is too short a time for a saga to arise in regard to the finding of a book in the days of Josiah and a reformation on the basis of this book. What the editor of Kings wrote out of his own head about the times of David and Solomon, perhaps even about the times of Hezekiah, may well be literary invention; but the days of Josiah were too near and too clear in the memory of his contemporaries for him to make up the story out of whole cloth.

Besides, from the point of view of the editor of Kings, what motive was there for the invention of the story of the finding of Deuteronomy? According to his theory, Deuteronomy was written by Moses, and was known to Israel from the time of Moses onward. David quoted it in his farewell words to Solomon; Solomon quoted it in his prayer at the dedication of the Temple; the early prophets quoted it in their denunciations; all the kings knew that they were violating its teaching in allowing the high places to remain, while Hezekiah removed them in obedience to its commands. Consistency with this conception would have required that the editor of Kings should record merely that Josiah carried out the provisions of Deuteronomy; instead of which he records the finding of this code as something new, about which high priest and king were in such uncertainty that they had to consult the Prophetess Huldah in order to learn what to think about it. The discovery of Deuteronomy as a hitherto unknown book is really a contradiction to the representation of the editor of Kings that Deuteronomy was in force throughout the entire earlier period. Hölscher says that Rd represented Josiah as obeying Deuteronomy merely because he was a good king, and all good kings observed this book.[59] If this was so, why then was Rd not satisfied with recording Josiah's obedience? Why did he represent him as finding Deuteronomy? The only reason for inserting this story was that the finding of Deuteronomy in the eighteenth year

[59] *Festschrift für Gunkel*, pp. 210ff.

of King Josiah was a well known historical fact which Rd could not conceal, even though it was hard to reconcile with his theory of the antiquity of Deuteronomy; and even though he could not tell how this book, which was well known down to the time of Hezekiah, came to be lost so completely that Hilkiah and Josiah did not recognize it.

Certain details, even of the verses which narrate the centralization of the cult by Josiah, support the credibility of the record. The defiling of the high places in 2 Ki. 23 8a is mentioned quite incidentally in connection with the account of the bringing up of the country priests to Jerusalem. This is not the way in which a deliberate fiction would be promulgated. Josiah is said to have defiled the high places only from Geba to Beersheba, the limits of the kingdom of Judah in his day. An inventor would have made the desecration much more extensive, as is the case in the obviously later verses 4c, 15—20 and in the narrative of Chronicles. The high places of the satyrs in 8b are never mentioned elsewhere in the Old Testament, and the satyrs only in Lev. 17 7. This curious detail must rest upon genuine historical knowledge.

The lack of correspondence of Josiah's treatment of the country Levites in 2 Ki. 23 9 with the law in Dt. 18 6—8 is also in favor of the historicity of the narrative. Deuteronomy granted the priests of the high places equal rights with the priests in Jerusalem; but Kings records that they were not allowed to minister at the altar, although they ate their portions of the sacred food. An inventor, who was trying to represent Deuteronomy as the code introduced by Josiah, would have been careful to record exact obedience to the law. It should be observed also that this conduct occupies a middle position between Deuteronomy and Ezekiel: Deuteronomy gave the country Levites full rights, Josiah deprived them only of the right to minister at the altar. Ezekiel, followed by P,[60] deprived them of all rights, and degraded them to the rank of servants who waited upon the legitimate Zadokite priests of

[60] Ezek. 44 10–14; Nu. 4 17–20, etc.

the Jerusalem Temple. This regular evolution is a strong witness for the truthfulness of the narrative of Kings.[61]

The *topheth* in the Valley of the Sons of Hinnom, where children were sacrificed to Yahweh under the title of *Melek* which, according to 2 Ki. 23 10, Josiah defiled, is not mentioned in Deuteronomy, nor is the Melek-cult, but it is confirmed by Jeremiah 7 31f. and 19 6, 11, 12f. Accordingly, this item also rests upon a sound historical tradition.

The account of Josiah's Passover in 2 Ki. 23 21-23 also bears the marks of genuine history. The peculiarity of this Passover was the fact that it was celebrated at the Temple in Jerusalem, instead of, as hitherto, at the local sanctuaries. Such a Passover had not been kept in the days of the Judges, or of the Kings, since the time when all the tribes were encamped together at Gilgal after the invasion of Canaan. But centralization of the Passover was the one feature of Deuteronomy's program that did not triumph in post-exilic Judaism. The old way, of keeping it as a family feast in the home, is the one prescribed by P,[62] and the one followed by the Jews ever since. Is it probable that a post-exilic writer would invent a celebration of the Passover that contradicted the orthodox and established practice of his day? Is it not more likely that this unique Passover was recorded simply because it was an historical fact? Moreover, it is obvious that something has fallen out of the text between 2 Ki. 23 21 and 22. In 21 we read: "The King commanded, Keep the Passover;" in 22: "Surely there was not kept such a Passover from the days of the Judges." Between these two statements there must once have stood an account of the way in which Josiah kept the Passover. This must have emphasized the novelty of centralization in accordance with Deuteronomy. This has been omitted by some later editor because of its contradiction to the law of P, while verse 23 was allowed to stand because it was not so obvious in

[61] See Budde, *ZATW*, xliv, 1926, p. 203; Gressmann, *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, p. 329.

[62] Ex. 12 1–20.

this case that the peculiarity of Josiah's Passover was its centralization. This shows how unlikely is the fabrication of a centralized Passover by a post-exilic editor. Hölscher's dismissal of this argument with the remark: "23 22 is obviously intended from the outset to be the immediate continuation of 23 21,"[63] is an utterly inadequate treatment of the problem.

In regard to this record of Josiah's Passover, Budde aptly remarks:[64] "In it, after the detailed account of all Josiah's individual reforms, the narrative as a whole culminates. It forms the reconciling, harmonious conclusion after all the destruction that the rest of the chapter had to narrate, the necessary basis for the encomium of Josiah in which the original account must have ended."[65]

(5) *What Book was the Basis of Josiah's Reformation, if it was not Deuteronomy?*—Critics who believe in the general historical credibility of 2 Ki. 22–23, but who deny that Deuteronomy was written before the exile, are under obligation to show, what the book was that was found in the eighteenth year of Josiah and that was the basis of his reformation. On this point hardly any two members of the school of Gramberg agree. Gramberg himself maintains[66] that it was E's Book of the Covenant in Ex. 20 23 to 23 33, but this code contains no law of centralization. Vatke[67] identifies Josiah's book with the J legislation in Ex. 12 19–24, 32–34, but this also does not demand centralization. Seinecke thinks[68] that it was a brief collection of Jeremiah's prophecies, but this fails to explain the specific reforms of Josiah. Fries[69] identifies it with J's Book of the Covenant in Ex. 34. Cullen holds[70] that Josiah found the prophetic exhortations of Dt. 5–11,

[63] *Festschrift für Gunkel*, p. 209n.

[64] *ZATW*, xliv, 1926, p. 192.

[65] See also H. Schmidt, *TLZ*, xlviii, 1923, col. 290; Gressmann, *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, 330ff.; Nowack, *Festschrift für Marti*, 1925, p. 225.

[66] *Kritische Geschichte*, i, p. 306f.

[67] *Die Religion des A. T.*, i, p. 505.

[68] *Geschichte*, i, p. 387.

[69] *Die Gesetzesschrift des Königs Josias.*

[70] *The Book of the Covenant in Moab*, pp. 13, 15f.

but not the code of Dt. 12–26. Kennett suggests[71] that it may have been the code of J, or a collection of prophetic sayings. Berry maintains[72] that Josiah's book was the Holiness Code in Lev. 17–26; but Freed has shown[73] that the Holiness Code depends on Deuteronomy, and that it by no means covers all the reforms of Josiah. Hölscher dismisses the problem lightly with the remark: "If the law-book of Hilkiah the priest is not identical with Deuteronomy, one naturally may ask, whether it is preserved in any other collection of laws in the Old Testament. This question, however, makes demands on our literary tradition which from its very nature it cannot fulfil, and which for this reason ought not to be presented."[74] Similarly Horst observes: "One can think of nothing else than a prophetic book that came into the hands of the King and made such a huge impression upon him . . . What prophetic book that may have been we are no longer able to say."[75]

The problem cannot be dismissed in this careless fashion. Josiah's reformation was the most important event in the religious history of the period of the monarchy. It marked the partial victory of Prophetism and the birth of Judaism. The book on which this reformation was founded was the first book of the Old Testament to be recognized as canonical. A book of such importance and of such influence upon history cannot have been lost. It must have been cherished and preserved, whatever else was allowed to perish. As Reuss remarks: "The narrative of the Book of Kings would present us with an unsolvable riddle, if the book that was found was once more lost for posterity."[76] From the time of Josiah onward the Old Testament writers unanimously assert that Josiah's book was Deuteronomy, and not a trace of any other book that will explain Josiah's reformation is found either in tradition or in the extant literature of the Old Testament.

[71] *JTS*, vi, 1905, p. 184; vii, 1906, p. 492.
[72] *JBL*, xxxix, 1920, pp. 44–51.
[73] *JBL*, xl, 1921, pp. 76–80; see Budde, *ZATW*, xliv, 1926, p. 214.
[74] *Festschrift für Gunkel*, p. 213.
[75] *ZDMG*, lxvii, 1923, p. 234.
[76] *Geschichte des Alten Testaments*, p. 374.

c) **Deuteronomy is known to Literature after Josiah's Reformation.**—The Books of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah, Haggai and Zechariah in their present form present numerous and unmistakable parallels to Deuteronomy. Advocates of the current theory explain this fact as due to quotation of Deuteronomy by these writings.

The school of Gramberg denies the validity of this argument. Seinecke,[77] Kennett,[78] Cullen,[79] and Berry, [80] claim that Deuteronomy quotes Jeremiah, not Jeremiah Deuteronomy. This position is so difficult to maintain that Hölscher and Horst resort to the different expedient of rejecting all the parallels to Deuteronomy in these prophets as late interpolations. Basing his analysis on the work of Duhm, but going much further, Hölscher cuts out of the Book of Jeremiah every sentence that contains a suggestion of dependence on Deuteronomy, leaving only a few poetical oracles and a few biographical narratives; and then triumphantly remarks: "Jeremiah, accordingly, shows nowhere acquaintance with Deuteronomy." Horst analyzes the Book of Jeremiah into the same two sources that he finds in 2 Ki. 22–23. Source A dates from the time of Haggai and Zechariah. It represents Jeremiah's ministry as beginning after the death of Josiah, and it knows nothing of Deuteronomy. Source B, written after 500 B. C., has the purpose of remodeling source A to conform to Deuteronomy, and of representing it as introduced with the authority of the prophet. This source has no historical value.[81]

In reply to these theories it must be admitted that some of the prophecies of Jeremiah bear clear evidence of editorial amplification; but that the amplifications are as extensive as Hölscher and Horst assume, or that the original prophecies of Jeremiah are ignorant of Deuteronomy, is far from being established at present. To assume that everything that shows knowledge of

[77] *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, i, p. 386.
[78] *JTS*, vi, 1905, p. 183; vii, 1906, pp. 481f.
[79] *The Book of the Covenant in Moab*, pp. 19ff.
[80] *JBL*, xxxix, 1920, p. 46.
[81] Hölscher, *ZATW*, xl, 1922, p. 238; Horst, *ZDMG*, lxxvii, 1923, pp. 224ff.

Deuteronomy is necessarily late, simply begs the question. The only way to solve this problem is to continue the study of the linguistic, literary, historical, and theological evidences of the Book of Jeremiah; and to base conclusions in regard to its composition upon this evidence. Then, if the older parts are found to be ignorant of Deuteronomy, Hölscher and Horst may use this as an argument against the current theory of the age of Deuteronomy; but until some degree of finality has been reached in the criticism of Jeremiah, this book cannot safely be used as proof of the non-existence of Deuteronomy.

The Holiness Code in Lev. 17–26 is certainly known to Ezekiel and, therefore, must have been written shortly before the exile. It contains a number of parallels with Deuteronomy. This fact is commonly interpreted as due to quotation of Deuteronomy. This also is denied by the school of Gramberg. Kennett and Berry try to show that Deuteronomy depends upon the Holiness Code, rather than the reverse; but this effort is generally regarded as unsuccessful. Hölscher admits the dependence of the Holiness Code on Deuteronomy, but dates the Holiness Code in the time of Ezra.[82]

The present form of the Book of Ezekiel shows unmistakable acquaintance with Deuteronomy.[83] This fact is claimed by adherents of the current theory to indicate that Deuteronomy must be pre-exilic. The Book of Ezekiel was regarded as pseudepigraphic by Zunz, Geiger, Wetzstein, Seinecke, and Vernes; but the vast majority of critics have accepted it as authentic. Hölscher admits that the genuineness of most of the book cannot be questioned, but here again he applies the critical knife.[84] All the passages that show contacts either with Deuteronomy or the Holiness Code he excises as later editorial insertions. The real Ezekiel, he says, knew nothing about centralization of the cult, and did not disapprove of the high places as such, but only of heathen

[82] *Op. cit.*, p. 255.

[83] *E. g.*, Ezek. 6 3, 6.

[84] *ZATW*, xl, 1922, pp. 239ff.; *Hezekiel, der Dichter und das Buch*, 1924.

rites that were practised at them. The law-code in Ezekiel 40—48 is later than both Deuteronomy and the Holiness Code. It was not written until after the time of Ezra, and is also an interpolation in the Book of Ezekiel. All that can be said about this hypothesis is, that it is even more destitute of foundation than Hölscher's treatment of Jeremiah, and is obviously inspired solely by the desire to get rid of the testimony of Ezekiel to the pre-exilic origin of Deuteronomy.

In regard to the later prophets Hölscher claims that Deuteronomy is not known to the genuine Deutero-Isaiah, although it appears in a few glosses. All references to Deuteronomy in Haggai and Zechariah are later additions. Deuteronomy is first known to Malachi and Trito-Isaiah and to the genuine parts of Nehemiah.[85]

As to the relation of Deuteronomy to the other Old Testament law-codes, Hölscher holds that the documents of the Hexateuch and of the historical books are in the main rightly analyzed by the present school of criticism, and that the *relative* order in which the codes are arranged is also correct; that is, the legislation in all particulars regularly develops in the order J, E, Deuteronomy, the Holiness Code in Lev. 17—26, Ezekiel 40—48, and the Priestly Code. The *absolute* dating of these documents, however, in the current theory is wholly wrong. Since Deuteronomy belongs to the time of Nehemiah, the Holiness Code, Ezekiel, and the Priestly Code, are all later than Nehemiah. The code introduced by Ezra, according to Neh. 8, was not the Priestly Code. On the other hand, the acceptance of the entire Pentateuch by the Samaritans forbids the dating of the Priestly Code long after Ezra.[86] Accordingly, the entire legal development from Deuteronomy to the Priestly Code is crowded into a period of about fifty years; but it is most unlikely that a development involving so many radical changes (e. g., the degradation of the Levites from the priesthood, the elevation of the high priest above the other priests, the addition

[85] *Ibid.*, pp. 245–248.
[86] *Ibid.*, pp. 233, 255.

of the Feast of Trumpets and the Day of Atonement to the three annual fests of Deuteronomy, the addition of the sin-offering and the guilt-offering to the original burnt offering and sacrifice, and the vastly increased endowment of the clergy in the Priestly Code beyond Deuteronomy) could have come about in so brief an interval of time.[87]

d) **The Internal Evidence.**—The school of De Wette claims that numerous details of the legislation of Deuteronomy show that it was composed in the seventh century B. C., shortly before its discovery by Josiah. This claim also is denied by the school of Gramberg.

Into the very elaborate details of this controversy there is no space to go here. The evidence for the current view is presented by Professor Dahl in another article in this number of the JOURNAL. The answers to this evidence, and the counter-evidence of the school of Gramberg, will have to be left undiscussed for the present, except as to the one fundamental issue of Deuteronomy's demand for centralization of sacrifice at Jerusalem.

(1) *Non-Existence of Centralization before the Exile.*—The claim is made by all the advocates of the late date of Deuteronomy that centralization of sacrifice at Jerusalem did not exist before the exile, consequently Deuteronomy's demand for centralization cannot be pre-exilic. Gramberg formulated this argument as follows: "While we agree with Herr Doktor De Wette that historical occurrences of the time of Josiah were the cause of much that is formulated in Deuteronomy, we cannot agree with him that the book produced under Hezekiah and discovered under Josiah was Deuteronomy, or any part of it; because the unity of cult on which our book insists so strongly . . . could only be enunciated as law after Josiah's reform by a lawgiver who feared that the freedom of cult which previously had existed uncondemned might through slackness again be introduced . . . In deciding this question we must hold fast to the critical principle, from which we dare not depart, that a law can never be promulgated until usage has made

[87] See H. Schmidt, *TLZ*, xlviii, 1923, col. 291.

it general custom, or it is demanded by some specific advantage. Prohibitory legislation is directed only against existing abuses, or against abuses that are apprehended from existing circumstances, or from analogous cases. Accordingly, the presuppositions, or even individual written sources of Deuteronomy, may date from the times of Hezekiah or of Josiah; but the book itself, not only because of individual traits, but because of its entire spirit and contents, cannot have been written before the end of the exile."[88]

In a similar strain Cullen remarks: "A new law-code is usually not the instrument but the outcome of a successful revolution."[89] Kennett also says: "The main purpose of this code is the centralization of worship for all Israel, and the unification of Israel on the lines of exclusive worship of Jehovah. Since it is admitted that this centralization of worship must be brought into connexion with Josiah's destruction of the high places, the first question to be asked is this: Is the law of the one sanctuary as given in Deut. xii the cause, or the ultimate outcome of Josiah's reformation?" . . . "It may indeed be claimed as an axiomatic principle in an enquiry into the origin of any code of laws, that the enactments of such a code must have been directed towards an existing state of things. Sane men legislate for a situation in which legislation is not only desirable but has a reasonable chance of producing results, not for one which may never arise. It is unnecessary to elaborate this point, a mere enumeration of the outstanding features of the Deuteronomic law being sufficient to disprove the idea that it could have arisen in the days of Manasseh or Hezekiah or at an earlier date . . . In the first place there is a limiting of sacrifice (*for all Israel*) to the one altar, and the equally revolutionary enactment that the fat and blood of domestic animals need not be offered at the altar."[90]

[88] *Kritische Geschichte*, pp. 66ff.; see also Maurice Vernes, *Précis d' histoire juive*, 1889, pp. 468ff.

[89] *The Book of the Covenant in Moab*, p. 13.

[90] *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, pp. 3–6.

Kegel,[91] Oestreicher,[92] Welch,[93] Staerk,[94] Šanda,[95] are so impressed with this argument based upon Deuteronomy's centralization of the cult, that, in order to escape the conclusion that Deuteronomy is post-exilic, they adopt the drastic measure of denying that Deuteronomy demands centralization. "Nicht Kulteinheit sondern Kultreinheit" is the aim of this code. The Deuteronomic phrase, "the place that Yahweh will choose in one of thy tribes to cause his name to dwell there," they interpret as meaning, not Jerusalem exclusively, but any sanctuary that has been consecrated by a revelation of Yahweh, as in the Book of the Covenant, Ex. 20 24, "in every place where I cause my name to be remembered I will come to thee and bless thee." The impossibility of this translation of the Deuteronomic phrase from a purely linguistic point of view has been so thoroughly demonstrated by König,[96] Gressmann,[97] and Budde,[98] that there is no need to linger on this point. If the pre-exilic origin of Deuteronomy is to be defended at all, it cannot be by the denial that Deuteronomy demands centralization of the cult at Jerusalem.

A sounder method of attacking the problem is to scrutinize more closely the presuppositions on which the argument of the school of Gramberg rests. Is it true that a law cannot be given until an institution is established? Was it impossible to command centralization before the high places had disappeared? Of course, one must admit that laws are not given in advance of needs. Legislation in regard to agriculture, commerce, industry, city-life, and the king, such as we find in the Book of the Covenant,

[91] *Die Kultus-Reformation des Josia: Die Aussagen der modernen Kritik über II Reg. 22–23 kritisch beleuchtet*, 1919.

[92] *Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz* (*Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, xxiv, 4, 1923). See also *ZATW*, xliii, 1925, pp. 246–249.

[93] *The Code of Deuteronomy, a New Theory of its Origin*, 1924.

[94] *Das Problem des Deuteronomium*, 1924.

[95] *Moses und der Pentateuch*, 1924.

[96] *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, pp. 337–346.

[97] *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, pp. 331f.

[98] *ZATW*, xliv, 1926, pp. 184–189. See also Bewer, *supra*, pp. 309ff.

Deuteronomy, and the Holiness Code, obviously cannot have been given by Moses; but is this parallel to the law of the central sanctuary in Deuteronomy? Laws are not given in advance of *needs*, but they certainly are given in advance of general *observance* of their provisions. The worship of foreign gods was forbidden before it ceased in Israel. The Emancipation Proclamation was promulgated before the disappearance of slavery from the United States. The Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution and the Volstead Act were adopted, not because alcoholic beverages had ceased to exist in America, but because a majority of the voters thought that they ought to be abolished. In like manner laws forbidding the high places might well be given before disappearance of the high places.

The real question is, whether as early as pre-exilic times there was a party in Judah that disapproved of the high places, and could have proposed a plan for abolishing them. Of the existence of such a party there can be no doubt. The rejection of sacrifice in general by the prophets of the eighth century had for its natural corollary the rejection of the high places at which sacrifices were offered. The prophets' condemnation of confusion of Yahweh with the local baʿals of Canaan involved the condemnation of the sanctuaries at which this syncretism existed. When Amos said: "Come to Bethel and transgress, to Gilgal, and multiply transgression;"[99] "Seek ye me, and ye shall live, but seek not Bethel, nor enter into Gilgal;"[100] "They that swear by the sin of Samaria, and say: As thy god, O Dan, liveth; and as the way of Beersheba liveth; they shall fall and never rise up again,"[101] he condemned these high places, not as rivals to Jerusalem, but as seats of the baʿalized cult of Yahweh. In this condemnation his successors unquestionably shared. When in 701 Sennacherib desecrated all the local sanctuaries of Israel, and Jerusalem alone escaped, as Isaiah had predicted, the obvious inference was that

[99] Am. 4 4.
[100] Am. 5 4–5.
[101] Am. 8 14.

Yahweh had rejected the high places, and had "chosen Jerusalem out of all the tribes to cause his name to dwell there." In the light of this event there is no sufficient reason to doubt the statement of 2 Ki. 18 4 that, already in the eighth century, "Hezekiah removed the *bāmôth*, and broke down the *maṣṣēbhôth*, and cut down the *'ashērāh*, and broke in pieces the bronze (serpent) that Moses had made." Accordingly, it is not improbable that as early as the days of Manasseh there was a prophetic reform party that desired the abolition of the high places and the limitation of the cult to Jerusalem, and that this party formulated its demands in Deuteronomy.[102]

(2) *Impracticality of Deuteronomy.*—The further claim is made by the school of Gramberg that the carrying out of the law of the central sanctuary involved a number of impractical corollaries that could not have been demanded in pre-exilic times. Hölscher expresses himself thus: "The chief peculiarity of the Deuteronomic legislation is its idea of the centralization of the cult. In accordance with this point of view, the author has tried to remodel the old traditional legislation; one cannot conclude, however, that he has really succeeded in doing this. Almost everywhere he has stuck fast in ideal demands whose execution is hardly thinkable. His wishes are often far removed from every consideration of the facts of an existing national and governmental life. Consequently, even those provisions in which the ideas of the ur-Deuteronomic lawgiver himself come to expression show themselves in a high degree impracticable; and besides, so far as we can check them up, they were never really put into operation. The later legislation of the Priestly Code simply ignored the impractical idealism of Deuteronomy . . . The idealistic character of the Deuteronomic legislation shows that it did not originate in the pre-exilic kingdom of Judah, but in a time after the fall of Jerusalem. The Deuteronomic law did not grow up organically out of the old political and social life, but is an ideal program that with its bold demands seeks to master and transform reality.

[102] See Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, p. 220.

In this respect the Deuteronomic law-book, as is well known, does not stand alone. The law of Lev. 17, and especially the legal program in Ezek. 40ff., are similarly idealistic. The Deuteronomic law-book belongs in the period of these legislative proposals . . . When the 'messianic' restoration of Israel comes, then perhaps the idealistic demands of this code can be realized."[103]

The festal legislation of Dt. 16 1—17 in particular is challenged. Hölscher, for instance, asks: "Are the pilgrimages to Jerusalem at all possible, which are required even of those who live far away, when they bring their holy things and their vows, and on which they must be accompanied by their entire families and servants? At all the three great feasts the entire population of the land is required to repair to Jerusalem. They are obliged to take along, not only all the members of the family, but also the male and the female slaves, and even the Levites, aliens, widows, and orphans. There remains literally nobody at home, and one cannot help asking, Who takes care of the minor children, or who attends to the cattle? Especially when, as in the case of the Feast of Tabernacles, a seven-day stay in Jerusalem is demanded . . . It is supposed that the population of Judah before the exile was about 120,000; all these people must appear at once 'before Yahweh,' that is, in the court of the Temple in Jerusalem, to celebrate their sacrificial meals. Imagine the multitude of victims that would then have been slaughtered simultaneously in the Temple. In all this I cannot see any picture of reality."[104]

This argument reads into Deuteronomy more than is justified by a natural interpretation of its language. The old Book of the Covenant had prescribed, "Three times in the year all thy *males* shall appear before Yahweh." This law the author of Deuteronomy wished to preserve, as far as was possible under the new conditions of the central sanctuary. Accordingly, he repeated it in 16 16 with the addition, "in the place which Yahweh shall choose."

[103] *ZATW*, xl, 1922, pp. 227–230.
[104] *Op. cit.*, p. 182.

It is hardly likely that, under the more difficult new conditions, he wished to make the law more stringent than it had been in the Book of the Covenant. Hölscher assigns this verse to the later editor, but why should this editor have demanded that only the males should come, if the original Deuteronomy had insisted that every Israelite should be present? The Passover law in 16 1–2, 5–7 says only, "Thou shalt sacrifice the Passover . . . in the place that Yahweh shall choose . . . Thou shalt roast and eat it in the place which Yahweh thy God shall choose, and thou shalt turn in the morning and go unto thy tents." Here also only the male Israelite is contemplated. Hölscher assumes that the attendance of the entire family in Jerusalem at Passover is desired in Dt. 16 1–2, as is specified in the case of the Feast of Weeks and also of Tabernacles (Dt. 16 11, 14), but this is by no means certain. In view of these facts it is apparent that the statements in verses 11, 14 about the whole family being present are counsels of perfection. The lawgiver wishes the head of the house, as far as possible, to bring his family with him to the feast; but he does not give a categorical command, and he does not provide any penalty for those who stay away. The requirement is the same as in later Judaism and in Muhammadanism, where the pilgrimage is regarded as highly desirable for all who can make it; but is not considered obligatory upon everybody.[105]

Elhorst regards it as probable that only the primitive nomadic Feast of Passover stood in *Urdeuteronomium*, and that the agricultural festivals, Unleavened Bread, Feast of Weeks, and Tabernacles, were discarded by it on account of their association with the Canaanite high places; but that they were subsequently inserted by a later editor.[106] This view is approved by Nowack,[107] and is favorably mentioned by Budde.[108] If this be true, then the mention of the entire family, which is absent from the Passover

[105] See Löhr, *Das Deuteronomium*, 1925, p. 181; Budde, *op. cit.*, pp. 181 ff.
[106] *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, pp. 136–145.
[107] *Festschrift für Marti*, p. 225.
[108] *Op. cit.*, p. 182.

law, did not stand in the original Deuteronomy, and no conclusion in regard to the age of the code can be based upon this phenomenon.

Another impractical consequence of the centralization of sacrifice is the demand that the annual tithe and the triennial tithe for the poor shall be brought up to Jerusalem (Dt. 14 22–29)[109]. Equally impractical is the requirement that the firstlings of all clean animals shall be brought to Jerusalem for sacrifice (Dt. 15 19–23).[110] These laws, it is claimed, are so difficult of execution that it is inconceivable that they should have been propounded by a pre-exilic reformer.

Still another impractical consequence of centralization is the requirement that the Levites of the abolished high places shall have the right to come to Jerusalem and minister there at the altar, and to eat of the holy things (Dt. 18 6–8). Gramberg already found this demand impossible before the exile.[111] Kennett remarks: "It is surely improbable that in the days of Josiah, or earlier, provision would have been made by Judaean legislators for the case of a Levite coming from North Israel."[112] "The outstanding features of the Deuteronomic law . . . disprove the idea that it could have arisen in the days of Manasseh or Hezekiah, or at an earlier date . . . It is insisted that, inasmuch as the Levites have no share in the land of the village communities, they are to be provided for, not only out of the sacrificial offerings, but by charity (xviii. 2ff., cf. xii. 12, xiv. 27, 29). It is specially enacted that a Levite from any part of Israel may come to the central sanctuary, and that his brother Levites there are to receive him as an equal (Deut. xviii. 6–8)."[113] Hölscher likewise asks: "Can the interest in the country Levites which is so much in evidence throughout this law-book really be ascribed to the Zadokites of Jerusalem?" "The Levitical priesthood of Jerusalem

[109] Edouard Reuss, *L'histoire sainte et la loi*, ii, 1897, p. 307, n. 1; Hölscher, *ZATW*, xl, 1922, pp. 183ff.

[110] Hölscher, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

[111] *Op. cit.*, p. 67.

[112] *JTS*, vii, 1906, p. 486.

[113] *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*, pp. 5–7.

(after the exile) feels its solidarity with the Levites in the villages; these Levites also still belong to the general guild of the clergy, although they sacrifice no longer at the high places; and accordingly, the lawgiver urges incessantly that these country Levites shall not be deprived of their incomes or privileges, and that they shall be granted the right of sacrificing in Jerusalem."[114]

In reply to all these considerations it may be said, that equally, or even more impractical ideals, were cherished by the early codes and by the pre-exilic prophets. The extermination of the Canaanites, for instance, was enjoined by the oldest Hebrew legislation;[115] but this was always impossible, and no serious attempt was made to carry it out. The complete abolition of sacrifice and holy days was demanded by the pre-exilic prophets.[116] This was far less practicable than the Deuteronomic ideal of limitation of sacrifice and holy days to Jerusalem. The carrying out of the prophets' demand would have meant the overturning of all existing forms of religion, since for early Israel, as for all antiquity, religion expressed itself mainly in ritual. The nation as a whole was incapable of accepting and carrying out the prophetic program, as is shown by the Deuteronomic compromise, the Priestly Code, and the history of Judaism. The ideal that religion is righteousness, not ritual, is not yet accepted even in modern Judaism and in Christianity; yet the Prophets dared to proclaim it, in spite of its evident impracticability. Is it then impossible that the prophetically minded author of Deuteronomy, while abandoning the thoroughgoing prophetic demand for the abolition of sacrifice, should have proposed the less strenuous ideal of the abolition of sacrifice at the high places, and its limitation to Jerusalem only? This at least might have seemed practicable in pre-exilic times.[117]

[114] *ZATW*, xl, 1922, pp. 182, 229.

[115] Ex. 23 29, 30, 33.

[116] Am. 4 4–5; 5 21–25; Hos. 6 6; 8 13; Isa. 1 11–17; 22 1–14; Mic. 6 6–8; Jer. 6 20; 7 21–22.

[117] See Gressmann, *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, p. 335; H. Schmidt, *TLZ*, xlviii, 1923, col. 291; J. M. P. Smith, *Jour. Rel.*, vi, 1926, p. 409.

As Budde observes, "It is a fundamental and serious fault of the thoroughgoing discussion of Hölscher, that again and again he follows the lead of De Wette in calling and in treating Deuteronomy as an official law for the state, 'an authoritative and officially recognized law-code introduced into the kingdom of Judah,' and that, in accordance with this view, he speaks continually of the 'law-giver,' and of 'his demands.' Deuteronomy is not a law-book, though it is called ספר התורה, but it is a *program*. Hölscher himself recognizes this in other places (*e. g.*, *ZATW*, xl, 1922, pp. 229, 253) . . . Deuteronomy was preserved for us, not because it presented the codified law as it existed in the time of Josiah, but as the testament of Moses, as the farewell address in which for all time to come he sought to warn his people to regulate all its affairs in accord with the will of Yahweh, to make laws for itself through which it should continue to live and to prosper.)"[118] "The original form (of Deuteronomy) which embodies its characteristic idea does not belong to the priesthood . . . This conception is today a great heresy; so far as I know, all the recent discussers of the question without exception contend for the priestly origin of the book. How little people today think that they have to take account of the view of Wellhausen, Marti, and myself, for instance, that Deuteronomy is essentially a prophetic work, is shown best by Hölscher's treatment, who dismisses this view (p. 165) with the two words between dashes, 'not prophetic'."[119] Even granting the impractical idealism of Deuteronomy, one cannot help asking, whether this idealism was any more practical in post-exilic times than in pre-exilic times. Hölscher, as Budde remarks, "whenever he thinks that he can prove an 'idealistic attitude' in the supposedly 'authoritative and officially recognized law-book for the state,' is ready at once to assign it to the period after the exile. This period has for him the value of a mystical fourth dimension in which all things are possible."[120]

[118] *ZATW*, xliv, 1926, p. 180, cf. p. 206.
[119] *Ibid.*, p. 219.
[120] *Ibid.*, p. 207.

In post-exilic times, the children of the captivity in Babylonia and the Diaspora in other lands had to be considered. It was impractical for these people to come to Jerusalem. Other sanctuaries had been established by the scattered Jews, such as that at Elephantine; and synagogue-worship had begun to grow up as a substitute for Temple-worship. If legislation always reflects existing practice, would it not have been natural for a post-exilic lawgiver to make room in his system for worship away from Jerusalem? It is inconceivable that so difficult a program as centralization could have been attempted in post-exilic times, unless it had been inherited from pre-exilic times. Post-exilic Judaism was not characterized by originality, but by the desire to discover and to reproduce the customs of the forefathers. It is contrary to all analogy to suppose that so colossal an innovation as the limitation of the cult to Jerusalem was the creation of the post-exilic community in Palestine, or of the exiles in Babylonia; and it is safe to say that the idea would never have entered into anybody's head but for the existence of this requirement in an authoritative pre-exilic book such as Deuteronomy.[121]

Difficult as centralization of the cult was, nevertheless it was observed by the Jews during the entire post-exilic period down to the destruction of the Temple in A. D. 70. If the legislation of Deuteronomy was not found impracticable after the exile, why should this legislation be pronounced impossible under the less difficult pre-exilic conditions?[122]

(3) *No Polemic against High Places.* Hölscher argues further that Deuteronomy does not polemize against the high places, as it must have done, if centralization of the cult had been an innovation. I quote his language: "Down to Josiah's time the sanctuaries outside of Jerusalem were regarded as legitimate. Would not a lawgiver, who for the first time contested their legitimacy and asserted the sole legitimacy of the sanctuary at Jerusalem, have polemized more clearly against the local sanctuaries?

[121] See Nowack, *Festschrift für Marti*, p. 224; Budde, *op. cit.*, p. 223.
[122] König, *ZATW*, xlii, 1924, p. 342.

Instead of this our lawgiver speaks only incidentally and indirectly about them as 'every place that thou seest' (12 13). He shows no animosity against them, demands nowhere their desecration or destruction. His words do not sound at all as if he needed any longer to fight for recognition of his fundamental principle by his readers. He assumes as established that Yahweh has chosen only a single place. The thing that he attacks is the practice that still exists in larger or smaller circles of offering burnt offerings elsewhere, or of consuming the tithes, firstlings, *etc.*, in the villages."[123] "The cause of the fall of the old state was transgression of the law, especially worship at the old Canaanite sanctuaries of the land, which the author regards as idolatry and heathen abomination. For the Jerusalem priests from whose midst this law issued there was only one sanctuary of Yahweh, the Temple on Zion. It is no new doctrine that the lawgiver wishes to introduce to his readers for the first time; he demands nowhere the 'removal' of the high places, but propounds only that which in his circle was regarded as self-evident, that there was only one central sanctuary chosen by Yahweh, that all sacrifices should be offered there, all tithes and firstlings be consumed there, and all feasts celebrated there."[124]

It is very doubtful whether these statements are in accord with the facts in the case. In Dt. 12 2–7 we read: "Ye shall surely destroy all the places wherein the nations that ye shall dispossess served their gods . . . Ye shall not do so unto Yahweh your God; but unto the place which Yahweh your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek;" and in Dt. 12 8–12: "Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes . . . but to the place which Yahweh your God shall choose to cause his name to dwell there, thither shall ye bring all that I command you." Here is unquestionable polemic against existing high places, but Hölscher escapes this difficulty

[123] *ZATW*, xl, 1922, p. 182.
[124] *Ibid.*, p. 229.

by assigning these passages to the later editor of Deuteronomy. It is hard to see, however, why the later editor should have introduced this polemic against non-existent high places when, *ex hypothesi*, *Urdeuteronomium* found it unnecessary to attack them.

Dt. 12 13f., according to Hölscher, belongs to *Urdeuteronomium*. This reads: "Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place that thou seest, but in the place which Yahweh thy God shall choose in all thy tribes, there thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings." Dt. 12 17f. also belongs to *Urdeuteronomium:* "Thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithes . . . but thou shalt eat them before Yahweh thy God in the place which Yahweh thy God shall choose." Dt. 16 5f. also is assigned to *Urdeuteronomium:* "Thou mayest not sacrifice the Passover within any of thy gates . . . but at the place which Yahweh thy God shall choose." Here is a clear attack upon existing sacrifice in the high places. Hölscher does not do justice to these passages when he dismisses them with the casual remark quoted above: "He (the author of *Urdeuteronomium*) assumes as established that Yahweh has chosen only a single place. The thing that he attacks is the practice that still exists in smaller or larger circles of offering burnt offerings elsewhere, or of consuming the tithes, firstlings, *etc.*, in the villages."[125] The frequent and labored repetition of the formula, "the place which Yahweh thy God shall choose out of all thy tribes to cause his name to dwell there, even his habitation," shows that the high places were anything but negligible quantities. P shows the genuine post-exilic standpoint in quietly ignoring the high places. The totally different attitude of Deuteronomy is the best evidence that it is not post-exilic.[126]

The conclusion to which one comes, accordingly, is that the advocates of the post-exilic date of Deuteronomy fail to refute the arguments of the school of De Wette for its origin in the seventh century B. C., and fail to produce any convincing evidence of its origin in the fifth century.

[125] *Ibid.*, p. 182.

[126] Budde, *op. cit.*, p. 207; Gressmann, *op. cit.*, p. 331.

C

THE CASE FOR THE CURRENTLY ACCEPTED DATE OF DEUTERONOMY

GEORGE DAHL
YALE UNIVERSITY

WITHOUT question this is a day of upheaval. The most 'assured' results of earlier critical investigation are being subjected to radical correction or even to utter rejection. Witness Eissfeldt with his postulate of a new "Lay" source (L) for the historical books from Genesis to Judges;[1] Mowinckel with his insistence upon the revision of prevalent conceptions regarding the origins of the Psalter;[2] and, most recently, Torrey with his convincing argument for the dismissal of Duhm's alleged "Trito-Isaiah" to the lumber room of useless and discarded theories, with the consequent rehabilitation of the greatest of Old Testament poets, the Second Isaiah.[3] These are typical instances and illustrations of the present ferment in critical thought. More directly pertinent to our present discussion, however, is the powerful and

[1] *Hexateuch-Synopse*, 1922; *Die Quellen des Richterbuches*, 1925.

[2] *Psalmenstudien II*, "Das Thronbesteigungsfest Yahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie", 1922.

[3] *The Second Isaiah: A New Interpretation*, 1928. See the appreciative reviews by J. A. Montgomery in the *Anglican Theological Review* XI, No. 2 (October 1928), pp. 165–168; and by G. A. Barton in *Christian Education* XII, No. 1 (October, 1928), pp. 40–45; also that in the *Expository Times* XXXIX, No. 12, (September, 1928), pp. 529–532.

persistently repeated challenge of the current view of the origin and date of Deuteronomy. Professors Bewer and Paton, my Symposium colleagues, have taken up and answered this challenge in the two preceding articles.[4]

It may be remarked, in passing, that these troublings of the waters of criticism will surely have, as always, at least one good result. Biblical study will evidently thus successfully avoid the peril of sinking into the deadly lethargy of a new dogmatism. Nor for the critic is there any immediate prospect of "flowery beds of ease." So keen is the challenge that jibes, good-natured and otherwise, greet the various "battles of the critics." In the preface to his book discussed above,[5] Welch cites a fling at Old Testament scholars by one of his own students. They are wittily characterized as "a band of cannibals who refreshed themselves by devouring one another." Despite such pleasantries, however, it must be quite obvious that the critical temper is not only a desirable but really the only tolerable one. All too easily opinions, whether they bear the label 'liberal' or 'conservative,' congeal into dogmas. Eternal vigilance is the price that must be paid alike for the healing of ancient error and the bringing to light of new and larger views of truth. Always and everywhere the true critic welcomes criticism. He realizes that criticism is, in a sense, his principal stock in trade. Thus he maintains an open and receptive attitude toward correction and contradiction even where his own matured and reasoned convictions are involved. The apostolic injunction to "prove all things," and to hold fast only to those opinions and points of view which are demonstrably good, finds a ready echo in the heart of the Biblical scholar. On this basis a suggested theory has often to be dismissed as "not proven." But even in such cases the critic usually finds materials for the improvement or enrichment of the hypothesis the new theory had sought to displace. Thus light, as well as an occasional wave of torrid heat, is almost invariably generated by the debates of the critics.

[4] *Supra*, pp. 305–321 and 322–357.

[5] *Supra*, pp. 307ff. See *The Code of Deuteronomy*, p. 5.

The primary task of the present paper is to supplement the foregoing articles of Professors Bewer and Paton by submitting a brief, as clear and concise as may be, in behalf of the commonly accepted date of Deuteronomy. A secondary purpose is to indicate, to some extent at least, the relative strength or weakness of the several links in the chain of evidence supporting the usual dating. Some threshing out of old straw is necessarily involved in developing this theme. Inevitably, too, there will recur certain points already made by my colleagues. This rehearsal of familiar arguments need not, however, prove to be a complete waste of valuable time and space. It is good for the student of Scripture to recapitulate occasionally the reasons for the critical faith that is in him.

Most emphatically is this true in the case of Deuteronomy. By unanimous consent this book is accorded a central and pivotal position in the study of Old Testament history, literature and religion.[6] The epochal reconstruction of the course of Hebrew history, which it has been the supreme service and merit of critical Biblical scholarship to mediate, depends for its validity first of all upon the essential correctness of our dating of Deuteronomy. In particular, the identification of the so-called "Fifth Book of Moses" with the "book of the law" mentioned in 2 Kings 22f. is generally regarded as the very keystone of the arch of Old Testament research. To abandon, or even seriously to modify, this finding won by the patient and unremitting toil of several generations of scholars, would involve a readjustment of the whole critical position which is nothing short of revolutionary.[7] To the

[6] Cf. G. F. Moore, *Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 64: "Deuteronomy is a fixed point, by reference to which the age of other strata in the Pentateuch may be determined, at least relatively." W. C. Graham in the *Journal of Religion* VII, 1927, p. 397, states: "It then becomes a sort of Meridian of Greenwich, a fixed point in chronological and psychological relationship to which most other literature can be placed." See also A. Menes, *Die Vorexilischen Gesetze Israels* (Beiheft ZATW No. 50, 1928), p. 53: "Mit dem Deut steht und fällt das ganze kritische Gebäude, das in den letzten Jahrzehnten des verflossenen Jahrhunderts mühsam aufgerichtet wurde."

[7] Hölscher's radical procedure in the dating of the Pentateuchal documents, as well as his quite arbitrary handling of the books of Jeremiah

question: Does a sober review of the evidence newly adduced justify any vital alteration of the prevailing view? the preceding papers have both returned a negative answer. It remains only to reenforce their arguments with a positive summing up of the reasons for holding fast to the commonly accepted position.

The current view of Deuteronomy dates back in its essentials to the appearance of de Wette's *Dissertatio critica* in 1805.[8] de Wette's thesis was developed, amplified and firmly established by Wellhausen[9] in 1876. Since then this hypothesis has been passed on by succeeding scholars with only slight modifications as a torch to illumine the path of the student of the Old Testament.[10]

It may be well at once to inquire: What are the principal features of the commonly accepted view of Deuteronomy? The following propositions will, I believe, gain the assent of a great majority of scholars:

1) Deuteronomy, either as a whole or in part,[11] was compiled

and Ezekiel—the last in his *Hesekiel: Der Dichter und das Buch* (Beiheft ZATW No. 39, 1924)—illustrates the lengths to which one may be forced to go in defense of a redating of Deuteronomy. On this point see A. S. Peake, *Recent Developments in Old Testament Criticism*, (Reprint from *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* XII, No. 1, January, 1928), pp. 17f.

[8] Cf. Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*, 1907, p. 5. Notice, however, that the suggestion that the law book discovered in the Temple in 621 B. C. was Deuteronomy goes back to Jerome and Chrysostom (cf. G. A. Smith, *Deuteronomy*, 1918, p. XLIII; Steuernagel, *Das Deuteronomium*[3], 1903, p. 3; Meinhold, *Einführung in das Alte Testament*[2], 1926, p. 199; Budde, *ZATW*, 1926, p. 178).

[9] See his *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*[2], 1889, pp. 189ff., where the work of Vater is given high praise. Cf. Simpson, *Pentateuchal Criticism*[2], 1924, pp. 31–33.

[10] Consult the standard introductions and commentaries.

[11] Wellhausen (*op. cit.*, p. 195) limits the original book of Deuteronomy to Ch. 12–26; Driver (*Deuteronomy*, 1895, p. LXXII) inclines to Ch. 1–3, 5–26, 28; G. F. Moore (*Enc. Bib.* I, Col. 1081; cf. *Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 58), Ch. 5–26, 28; Ryle (Hastings' *D. B.* I, p. 598), Ch. 5–26 (27 9, 10), 28; McFadyen (*Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 57), Ch. 12–26, 28, possibly 5–11; G. A. Smith (*op. cit.*, pp. XCIVff.), Ch. 12–26 (in the main) and in addition "some form of the discourses now in Ch. I–XI,

at some time in the century preceding the reforms described in 2 Kings 22f. as carried through by Josiah[12] in 621 B. C.

2) It furnished the immediate inspiration for these reforms, and served as the program for them.

3) Deuteronomy is essentially a prophetic, not a priestly, document—this despite the fact that its final form shows priestly influence.[13]

4) It must not be regarded as a formally adopted legal code, but rather as an ideal program.[14] The fact, *inter alia*, that no

XXVIII–XXX;" Kent (*Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents*, 1907, p. 34), Ch. 12–19, 26, 28; H. P. Smith (*Old Testament History*, 1903, p. 265, footnote 2) speaks of "the original book of Deuteronomy, which contained at any rate chapters 12–19, 26 and 28 of the present book." The presence of doublets, the alternation between the singular and plural forms of address, and various other criteria incline all these critics to posit certain later additions even within the sections indicated as genuine above. See G. A. Smith (*ibid.*, pp. XCVIff.) for an account of more detailed analyses by Bertholet, Budde, Cornill, *et al.* Steuernagel (*op. cit.*, pp. 4ff.) and Meinhold (*op. cit.*, pp. 202ff.) take cognizance of recent attempts to define the limits of the original book.

[12] Whether the original compilation of the book dates from the reign of Hezekiah (725–686 B. C.), or that of Manasseh (686–641 B. C.), or that of Amon (641–639 B. C.), or from the earlier years of Josiah's own reign, is not clear. Cf. the discussion of this point by G. A. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. XCIVff.; also in Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (= *L.O.T.*), 1913, p. 87. Recent criticism tends in the direction of a date fairly close to the reform itself, i. e., not too long before 621 B. C. So Budde in "Das Deuteronomium und die Reform König Josias" (*ZATW*, 1926, p. 222): "Ich vermag das Deuteronomium nur als ein Werk aus der Zeit für die Zeit zu begreifen." See also Kent, *op. cit.*, p. 33: "The original edition of Deuteronomy was completed somewhere between the beginning of Josiah's reign in 639 and the great reform in 621 B. C., rather than in the days of Manasseh or earlier." Ryle (*loc. cit.*, p. 603) places it "in the reign of Manasseh, or in the early part of the reign of Josiah."

[13] Budde, *loc. cit.*, p. 219: "an einen anderen Kreis als den des Prophetentums gar nicht gedacht werden kann." Cf. Driver, *L.O.T.*, p. 91: "Deuteronomy may be described as the *prophetic reformulation, and adaptation to new needs*, of an older legislation;" also Ryle, *loc. cit.*: "The work is that of a prophet, a religious teacher, not of a jurist or a statesman."

[14] See Paton, *supra*, pp. 353f.; also Budde, *loc. cit.*, pp. 206f.

penalties are indicated for such lapses as failure to attend feasts points in this direction.

5) The chief formal demand of the book is for the centralization of the cultus at the Temple in Jerusalem. This involves also the abolition of the local sanctuaries scattered throughout the land.[15]

6) In its present form Deuteronomy is both very old and quite new[16]; e. g., it contains laws that go back to the Book of the Covenant, and thence in some cases to a remoter antiquity, together with additions made subsequent to Josiah's time and even after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C.[17]

It is important in considering the question of the date of Deuteronomy that we keep clearly in mind all six of these tenets. As a matter of fact, practically all of them have been vigorously denied by one or another of the recent critics of the prevailing view.[18]

The argument for the usual dating has both its negative and its positive side. The former opposes the tradition, current among

[15] That the prohibition of local sanctuaries did not extend to those among the Dispersion is clearly shown by Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 1910, pp. 315ff.: "More than one Old Testament scholar, writing before the discovery of the letters from the colony at Yeb, had expressed the opinion that the ordinances in Deut. 12, forbidding worship at sanctuaries other than the one in Jerusalem, were intended to refer only to Palestine" (p. 316). Cf. Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*[5], 1927, pp. 39f., 447ff.; H. P. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 446f.; T. W. Davies in Peake, *A Commentary on the Bible*, p. 232; and see Is. 19 18f.; Mal. 1 11.

[16] G. F. Moore, *loc. cit.*, col. 1081f.; Driver, *L. O. T.*, pp. 90ff.; G. A. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. LXXII, LXXXVIII; Bewer, *supra*, p. 321.

[17] With the summary given above compare the commentaries and introductions; see also J. Battersby Harford, *Since Wellhausen*, 1926, pp. 92ff.; J. E. McFadyen, "The Present Position of Old Testament Criticism" in Peake's *The People and the Book*, 1925, p. 199; and *supra*, pp. 306, 324.

[18] Cf., e. g., G. R. Berry, "The Code Found in the Temple," *J. B. L.* XXXIX, 1920, pp. 44ff., together with the reply by A. Freed, *ibid.* XL, 1921, pp. 76ff.; G. Hölscher, "Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums," *ZATW.*, 1922, pp. 161ff.; A. C. Welch, *The Code of Deuteronomy*, 1924.

Jews and Christians alike, that Moses was the author of Deuteronomy as of the other books of the law. With this negative argument we are not in this paper so vitally concerned as with the positive one. Not one of the scholars whose arguments we have been considering in this Symposium has gone so far as to uphold the Mosaic authorship of the book as it stands.[19] It will suffice, therefore, merely to point out the main lines of evidence which seem to forbid adherence to the traditional view.

That Moses, then, is not the author of Deuteronomy is evidenced by the following facts:

1) Nowhere does the book as a whole claim to be written by him. In fact the compiler seems actually to go out of his way to make it clear that Moses is not the writer. At the very outset (1 1–5) and consistently throughout[20] he speaks of Moses *in the third person.* It may be retorted that 31 9, 24 describe Moses as writing "this Torah," and that 31 22 ascribes to him the composition of the "Song" in 32 1–43. But is it not clear that the fact that certain portions of the book are thus specifically ascribed to him[21] carries with it the implication that he must not be regarded as the author of the whole? It is, of course, conceivable that he might have written of himself in the third person.[22] In view, however, of the significant circumstance that Moses nowhere in the five Pentateuchal books makes the remotest claim to authorship, the balance of probability weighs heavily against such an hypothesis. The burden of proof would seem to lie upon those who make the assertion that Moses did write Deuteronomy.

[19] Welch (*ibid.*, p. 206), e. g., maintains only that "The Deuteronomic code is the outcome and one expression of that religious and national movement which rose in Benjamin and Ephraim, and which in its beginning is associated with the person of Samuel. It sprang up after the people had made good their footing in Palestine."

[20] Cf. 4 41–43, 44–49; 5 1; 27 1, 9, 11; 29 1; 31 1f., 9f., 14–25, 30; 32 44f., 48; 33 1; 34.

[21] As a matter of fact, even the portions definitely ascribed to Moses belong in their present form to a much later period. See the discussion below.

[22] Cf. Caesar's *Commentaries.*

2) It is hardly conceivable that Moses could have written the account of his own death contained in chapter 34. Verses 6 and 10, in addition, distinctly reflect a point of view far removed from the times of the great lawgiver. With what ill grace, moreover, would the latter verse, so extravagant in its encomium of Moses, come from the pen of the man who was "very meek, above all the men that were upon the face of the earth" (Num. 12 3). Withal, this chapter, so evidently from another hand than that of Moses, is marked throughout by the distinctive vocabulary and peculiar literary style which lends such definite character to the preceding sections of the book. So characteristic are these that even in the English translation they are easily recognizable. It must follow, then, as the night the day, that if Moses could not have written chapter 34, neither did he write the preceding chapters of Deuteronomy.[23]

3) Certain expressions recur in the course of the narrative which, like the water marks in the paper upon which a reputedly ancient document may be written, point irrefutably to a later age than that of Moses for the composition of the book. Three phrases in particular demand attention: (a) "Beyond the Jordan" (בעבר הירדן) is repeatedly used to designate Eastern Palestine.[24] But Moses is represented as making the farewell discourses reported in Deuteronomy in this very region. He could not refer to the place where he himself stood as being *beyond* the Jordan. The contention, occasionally made, that the term is a technical one, like the present Transjordania, lacks support in Old Testament usage; nor does it accord well with the way the expression is used in Deuteronomy itself. Manifestly the author of the phrase is a resident of Western Palestine. He cannot possibly be Moses who, according to chapter 34, died while Israel was still east of the river. (b) "At that time" (בעת ההוא)[25] and (c) "Unto this day" (עד היום הזה)[26] are employed in such a way as to imply that a

[23] Simpson, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

[24] See 1 1, 5; 3 8; 4 41, 46f., 49.

[25] 2 34; 3 4, 8, 12, 18, 21, 23.

[26] 3 14.

considerable period of time has elapsed between the actual occurrence of the events narrated and the recording of them in Deuteronomy. Certainly an interval of six months (Cp. Deut. 1 3 with Num. 33 38 and 20 22–28) would not justify such expression. Not Moses, but a much later writer, is clearly responsible for both expressions. It is worthy of special notice that all three of the phrases just cited constitute an integral part of the narrative. There is no sufficient reason for detaching them; nor can they be explained away as glosses.[27]

4) In the course of the positive argument to follow, definite evidence will be adduced to show that the book belongs in fact to a period removed from Moses by some six centuries or more. If this cumulative evidence is there rightly evaluated, the contention of Mosaic authorship for Deuteronomy falls to the ground.

The positive argument upon which rests the current view of the date may, for convenience, be considered under three heads: I. The Literary Argument, including (A), the evidence drawn from literary relationships; and (B) from style and vocabulary. II. The Religious Argument, i. e., the proof derived from the position of Deuteronomy as a major link in the chain of Hebrew religious development.[28] III. The Historical Argument which, while emphasizing the relationship which the book bears to the events narrated in 2 Kings 22f., also takes into some account the whole course of Old Testament history.

I. THE LITERARY ARGUMENT

(A) Literary Relationships

1) Here comes into consideration first of all the relation of Deuteronomy to the other collections of law incorporated in the

[27] On this whole question of reputed Mosaic authorship, see the standard discussion in Driver, *L. O. T.*, pp. 82ff. Cp. also the convenient brief summary in *A New Standard Bible Dictionary*, 1926, pp. 178f., art. "Deuteronomy."

[28] This line of approach involves some unavoidable overlapping with I (A), the evidence from literary relationships.

Pentateuch. Three such collections are generally recognized: (a) that of JE, commonly designated as the "Book of the Covenant" (or the "Covenant Code"), which appears in expanded form in Exodus 21–23, and in a briefer recension in Exodus 34; (b) the "Holiness Code" (H) in Leviticus 17–26; and (c) the remaining laws in Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, prevailingly ceremonial and liturgical in character, collectively called the "Priestly Code" (P). Driver's careful and exhaustive synopsis and comparison of the laws[29] leads him, as it has led other scholars, to the conclusion that the laws of JE in the Code of Ex. 21–23 (34) "form the foundation of the Deuteronomic legislation." This judgment is based not only on the numerous verbal coincidences, but also on the fact that Deuteronomy covers point for point almost the whole range of laws in JE. Whether the relationship between Deuteronomy and the Covenant Code is actually one of direct borrowing, however, is open to debate.[30] The not inconsiderable verbal differences, the variation in the arrangement of groups and of individual laws, and the fact that certain parts of the Book of the Covenant are ignored in Deuteronomy, have occasioned some doubt as to the exact form of the connection between the two codes. In general, nevertheless, it would appear that the relationship of Deuteronomy lies in the general direction of expansion and development of the earlier laws. Its code reflects a distinctly more advanced and complicated community life than that underlying Ex. 21–23 (34)[31].

So far as relationship with the Holiness Code is concerned Deuteronomy has, it is true, a few parallels. These would be natural in two codes of laws from the same land and from approximately the same period. But the whole tone and temper of the two codes are quite different. Certainly there is no evidence of dependence of one upon the other. If anything, H seems slightly later than D[32].

[29] *Deuteronomy*, pp. IVff.; *L. O. T.*, pp. 73ff.

[30] G. F. Moore, *loc. cit.*, col. 1083. Cf. G. A. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. LXVII.

[31] Ryle, *loc. cit.*, p. 600.

[32] Driver, *L. O. T.*, p. 76; G. F. Moore, *loc. cit.*, col. 1083.

With the Priestly Code the relationship is exceedingly remote[33]. Alike in vocabulary and substance the differences are many and great. Deuteronomy shows no dependence upon P. On the contrary it may be stated with absolute assurance that the P material (whether it ever existed as a separate code or not) is, with its highly developed formalism, distinctly later than Deuteronomy. A careful examination of its vocabulary and style, and a study of the religious and civil institutions reflected in its laws, shows that the completed Priestly Code belongs to a relatively late period in Hebrew history.[34]

It appears, then, that the order of the legal documents contained in the Pentateuch is JE, D, H, P. On the whole the evidence tends to show that the Deuteronomic Code stands about midway between the primitive Ritual Decalogue of Exodus 34 and the highly developed Priestly Code.

2) A strikingly similar result attends the examination, from a literary point of view, of the historical sections in Deuteronomy.[35] Wherever we are able to trace the original of the historical allusions in D, they point to JE as the sole source. It is apparent that JE and P had not been united when D wrote. The evidence for this is peculiarly cogent if one compares the reference to the fate of Dathan and Abiram in Deut. 11 6 with the expanded composite narrative of the same event in Num. 16. In the Numbers passage Korah is closely intertwined with the story of Dathan and Abiram. It is practically inconceivable that D could have omitted all reference to him had he read the story as at present recorded in Numbers. Manifestly his original contained only the Dathan and Abiram story of JE.[36] The evidence derived from the historical passages here and everywhere else supports that of the legal sections, viz., that the order of the documents is JE, D and P.

[33] Cf. G. A. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. LXVIIf.

[34] Driver, *L. O. T.*, pp. 126ff.

[35] Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, pp. 200ff.; Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. XIVff.; *L. O. T.*, pp. 79ff.; G. F. Moore, *loc. cit.*, col. 1083.

[36] For an explanation of the divergences between the JE and D records, see G. A. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. XVIIIff.

3) How, now, does it stand with the relationship of Deuteronomy to some of the remaining books in the Old Testament canon? Neither in the earlier strands of the historical books nor in the genuine utterances of the great social prophets of the eighth century—Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah—do we find a trace of the characteristic idioms or ideas of Deuteronomy. So far as the evidence goes the book was absolutely unknown to them all. But in the writings of the contemporary prophet, Jeremiah, the influence of Deuteronomy is constant and unmistakable.[37] Jer. 11 1–8 even represents the prophet as going about "in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem" proclaiming "the words of this covenant"—evidently the Deuteronomic law. Jer. 8 8, to be sure, strikes a different note. It seems to reflect the prophet's eventual disillusionment with the book,[38] or at any rate with the strongly ritualistic product which remained after "the false pen of the scribes had wrought falsely."[39] Duhm,

[37] H. W. Robinson, *Deuteronomy and Joshua*, pp. 45f.; see the list of parallels between Jeremiah and Deuteronomy in Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. XCIIIf.; cf. *L. O. T.*, p. 275. Notice especially the discussion of this point by Paton, *supra*, pp. 342–345.

[38] F. C. Porter in Sneath, *At One with the Invisible*, 1921, p. 24: "It seems probable that the hopes with which Jeremiah may first have greeted the appearance of this prophetic reformation of the popular religion were disappointed in the outcome. Certainly the religion he taught and the hopes he cherished were of different and even opposite nature and tendency." Skinner in *Prophecy and Religion*, 1922, has this to say: "We must at least believe that a trustworthy tradition lies behind the passage in Ch. XI; and the conclusion to which it naturally points is that Jeremiah was at first strongly in favor of the law of Deuteronomy, and lent his moral support to the reformation of Josiah" (pp. 102f.). And again: "Just as a woman has sometimes to be engaged to a man before she knows she cannot marry him, so Jeremiah may have had to go some way with the Deuteronomists in order to discover that he was of a different spirit from theirs" (p. 106). Cf. G. A. Smith, *Jeremiah*, 1923, pp. 134ff. on "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy;" also Lofthouse, *Jeremiah*, 1925, pp. 77ff.

[39] Budde (*loc. cit.*, p. 218), in discussing this verse, suggests: "Das Rätsel . . . . löst sich mit einem Schlage, wenn der Gestalt, in der Hilkia König Josia das Gesetzbuch einhändigte, eine andere vorausgegangen war, die von der Zentralisation und vom Kultus überhaupt noch nichts sagte

of course, greatly minimizes the Deuteronomic element in Jeremiah by the means of heroic use of hatchet and shears.[40] In this he is followed—yes even surpassed—by Hölscher, Horst and a few others.[41] It must, indeed, be admitted that many of the passages of Deuteronomic flavor in Jeremiah are exceedingly difficult morsels to digest.[42] Some of them are in all probability secondary. Nevertheless even Duhm finds echoes of Deuteronomy in genuine oracles of the prophet.[43] That Jeremiah knew Deuteronomy seems as clear as that his predecessors in the prophetic office did not. The most sceptical must at the least admit that the book throughout reflects an eventual, even if not contemporary, influence of Deuteronomy.

Besides Jeremiah, many other books written or compiled from his time on clearly show, though in varying measure, the influence of Deuteronomic thought and style.[44] Whether Ezekiel be, as Torrey contends,[45] "a pseudepigraphon written in the Greek

und wußte." G. A. Smith (*Deuteronomy*, p. XCVIII) mentions the "possibility that some editions of Deuteronomy originated during the last twelve years of the king's reign. There is no reason," he adds, "to seek a later date for any of the substance of the book."

[40] *Das Buch Jeremia*, 1901. See the criticisms of Duhm in Driver, *L. O. T.*, p. 273; and Peake, *Recent Developments in O. T. Criticism*, pp. 23f.

[41] Cf. Paton, *supra*, p. 342.

[42] A thorough and authoritative commentary on Jeremiah is a prime desideratum of Biblical science today.

[43] *Op. cit.*, pp. 86ff. (on Jer. 8 4–9 21).

[44] See the discussion in Meinhold, *op. cit.*, pp. 209ff.

[45] *Ezra Studies*, p. 288, note[8]; cf. the introduction to his "Notes on the Aramaic Part of Daniel" (*Trans. of the Conn. Acad. of Arts and Sciences*, XV, 1909). See also Burrows, *The Literary Relations of Ezekiel*, 1925, p. 105: "Thus my study . . . . has brought me—somewhat, I confess, to my surprise—to the conclusion that the view of Ez. as a product of the late pre-Maccabean period is not only possible but very probable." Hölscher in *Hesekiel: Der Dichter und Das Buch* (Beiheft *ZATW* 39, 1924) holds that our present book of Ezekiel contains but little of the authentic writings of the prophet, and that it is practically a later pseudepigraphon. Peake (*loc. cit.*, p. 25) comments: "It does not seem likely that the longestablished opinion as to the complete authenticity of the book will be maintained in its former rigour."

period," or a genuine product of the exile, there can be no possible doubt as to the influence of Deuteronomy upon it.[46] In Joshua the Deuteronomic redaction has been so complete as to stamp the whole book with its characteristic point of view. Judges and Kings are each cast into a late editorial framework that is demonstrably the product of the Deuteronomic school of historians. Samuel, especially in the first twelve chapters, shows in vocabulary, style and concepts that it, too, was part of the original Deuteronomic history. In Neh. 1 5—11; 9 6ff.; Dan. 9 4—19 occur prayers saturated with Deuteronomic phrases and ideas. Occasionally even the barren style of the Chronicler is fructified by a light shower of Deuteronomic phraseology.[47] Limits of space forbid a closer examination of the books and passages cited. But surely enough has been said to support Driver's contention that, while the literature produced before 621 B. C. shows no trace of Deuteronomic influence, after that date Deuteronomy in large measure "both gave the religious ideal of the age, and moulded the phraseology in which it was expressed."[48]

(B) Style and Vocabulary

Independent consideration of the criteria of style and vocabulary reenforces and confirms the conclusions drawn from a study of literary relationships.

1) The developed oratorical style of Deuteronomy, smooth, flowing and sustained, presupposes a long literary history behind it. Archaisms, except such as are employed to heighten the effect of sonorousness, are practically non-existent.[49] Rhythm, dignity and charm characterize the book throughout, particularly in the hortatory sections.[50] Skilful use is made of the repetition of significant phrases. Epithets and verbs are often piled up in

[46] See Burrows, ibid., pp. 19ff., for a careful and judicious examination of this question.

[47] Cf. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. XCIf.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. XCI.

[49] Cf. Ryle, *loc. cit.*, p. 601.

[50] Cf. G. A. Smith, *Deuteronomy*, pp. XIIff.

almost bewildering richness, and with cumulative power.[51] At times, it must be admitted, the device of repetition is somewhat overworked, and gives the impression of prolixity. In this the style marks the transition to later tendencies. In general, the advanced and artistic literary style points to a fairly late period in the history of the kingdom.

2) The vocabulary, too, is of a piece with that of the writings of the seventh century and the period immediately following. But this is by no means equivalent to saying that Deuteronomy possesses no distinctive vocabulary of its own. Quite the contrary is the case. The commentaries and introductions supply long lists of words and phrases used exclusively or predominantly by Deuteronomy and its school.[52] Some characteristic expressions are, "Jehovah, our, your *or* thy God," which occurs more than 300 times in the book; "which I am commanding thee *or* you," 33 times; "in thy gates," 27 times; "observe to do," 12 times; "stranger, fatherless and widow," 8 times; beside many individual words. The distinctive flavor of Deuteronomy can hardly be mistaken, wherever met. And that flavor seems reminiscent of about the seventh century B. C.

On the other hand, Deuteronomy shows none of the corrupt style or vocabulary that marks much of the latest Hebrew literature. It cannot therefore, on literary grounds, be reasonably dated anywhere near the period when Hebrew was becoming merely a literary language and loan-words were sweepimg in.[53] The literary argument, therefore would of itself point with a high degree of probability in the direction of a date before the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C., and yet not more than a century or so previous to that date.

[51] Cf. 4 9; 4 34; 6 7; 9 7; 10 17; 11 1; 10 12f., etc. Steuernagel, *op. cit.*, p. 41, remarks: "dass für die dtn. Sprache weniger einzelne Worte, als vielmehr formelhafte Wortkombinationen charakteristisch sind."

[52] Driver in *L. O. T.*, pp. 99ff., lists 41 of these; in *Deuteronomy*, pp. LXXVIIff. he gives 70; Steuernagel, *op. cit.*, pp. 41ff., mentions 89.

[53] Cf. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. LXXXVIIIff.; Moore, *loc. cit.*, col. 1086; Ryle, *loc. cit.*, p. 601.

II. THE RELIGIOUS ARGUMENT

Let us next turn to a brief consideration of the position of the book in the development of Hebrew religion.

1) In its religious ideas Deuteronomy follows closely after the great social prophets of the eighth century. The social passion of Amos, the national devotion of Isaiah and, above all, Hosea's dramatic and touching plea for the recognition of love as the essence of religion—all these find repeated expression in this remarkably human and warm-hearted program of reform. Love easily becomes the dominant note of the book.[54] The stress laid upon religion as based on the mutual love of God and man; the carrying over of this principle of love into practical injunctions urging humanitarian treatment of both man and beast; and the picturing of conduct as important more because it embodies this attitude of love than for its own sake—these look back to Hosea's epochal discovery of the love of God. Even civil and ritual law become surcharged with this spirit.[55]

2) The theism of the book reflects an advanced stage of religious thought. It exalts God in righteousness and holiness as well as in love. It is far removed in time as in spirit from the primitive concepts of the period of Saul and David. The crude monolatry of an Elijah is left far behind, and we come very near to the absolute monotheism of the Second Isaiah. In the law of the single sanctuary the idea of the unity of God is given concrete expression. Possibly the remarkable deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib in 701 B. C.[56] was the ultimate historical basis alike of the developed idea and of the law.[57]

[54] Cf. Lofthouse, *op. cit.*, p. 73: "Deuteronomy contains none of Hosea's lyrical abandon. But no one who has caught the distinctive music of Hosea —silent in Amos, Isaiah, and Micah—can miss it in the more precise and measured yet still unmistakably fervent devotion of Deuteronomy."

[55] G. A. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. XXVIff.; Ryle, *loc. cit.*, p. 601; Moore, *loc. cit.*, col. 1086.

[56] 2 Kings 18 13ff. = Isaiah 36f. While the presence of double narratives and of legendary accretions has long been recognized in these chapters, the essential trustworthiness of the tradition of a great deliverance of some sort seems established.

[57] Meinhold, *op. cit.*, pp. 200f.

3) In the false religions combatted, particularly the worship of the "host of Heaven,"[58] we apparently have a reflection of the Assyrian cults introduced by King Manasseh (695–641 B.C.). The prohibition of child sacrifice[59] also fits the conditions described in 2 Kings 21 1ff. as prevalent during the reign of the reactionary king.[60] A date late in Manasseh's reign or shortly thereafter seems to be here indicated.

4) Marti's familiar summary of the development of Hebrew religion[61] also points to this as the probable date of the composition of the book. It will be remembered that he distinguishes four periods: (1) the Nomadic; (2) the Agricultural; (3) the period of the Prophets; and (4) the religion of the Law.[62] As the embodiment of the teachings of the prophets, and the transition to the period when the law was being emphasized in certain quarters, Deuteronomy finds its place. No other period of Hebrew history fits this particular condition so well as the middle or end of the seventh century.

Thus the religious argument confirms the result attained by the literary approach.

[58] 17 3; cf. 4 19.

[59] 12 31; 18 10. Cf. B. D. Eerdmans in D. C. Simpson, *Old Testament Essays*, 1927, p. 83: "There is only one period in the history of Israel in which this attempt at reformation can be placed—viz., in the seventh century. For only in this period was the sacrifice of the firstborn and the cult of the sun, the moon, and the stars a prominent feature."

[60] Moore, *loc. cit.*, col. 1085.

[61] K. Marti, *Die Religion des Alten Testaments*, 1906, p. 10 *et passim*; translated by Bienemann, 1907.

[62] In view of the fact that the flowering of the Hebrew religion comes in this last period, the designation applied to it by Marti surely needs to be taken *cum grano salis*. Cf. Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, p. 311: "At the present day, we know that the most of the prophetical literature contained in our Old Testament, including the deepest and most wide-hearted expressions of the Hebrew faith which exist, dates from the Persian period. This was the golden age of Hebrew prophecy, as if was also that of Hebrew poetry." See also Torrey, *Second Isaiah*, pp. 131–134. Marti's term 'Law' does, however, decribe an important by-eddy of the period, and so may, for convenience, be retained.

III. THE HISTORICAL ARGUMENT.

The argument from history has necessarily crept in to the foregoing discussion of the literary and religious evidence. Literary development is, of course, a historical process. The evolution of a people's religion is the supreme fact in their history. It has been possible above to fix a probable date for Deuteronomy by tracing the culture and religion of the Hebrews as these are reflected in their sacred books.

In addition to this we have as evidence one of the most remarkable facts in the field of Old Testament criticism. This is nothing less than a record of the finding of a "book of the law"—evidently Deuteronomy—in the Jerusalem temple. In 2 Kings 22f. we read of the accidental discovery of the book, its submission to the prophetess Huldah, and the reforms of King Josiah based on the newly found law. The reference to a covenant (2 Kings 23 2f.), the carrying out of the Deuteronomic injunction to destroy the local high places (23 8, 15), the celebration of a centralized Passover at Jerusalem (23 21–23)—these and many other features seem to point unfailingly to Deuteronomy.[63] It is, on the face of it, in the highest degree improbable that this epochal book should have disappeared without leaving a trace. It must be preserved somewhere in the Hebrew canon. No other group of laws in the Old Testament corresponds, as does Deuteronomy, point for point with the measures carried out in these chapters of Kings. And so, as a matter of fact, modern scholars, following Jerome,[64] have with practical unanimity identified the book of 2 Kings 22f.

[63] See Paton, *supra*, pp. 325f., for a list of some twenty-six points of correspondence between 2 Kings 22f. and Deuteronomy. In the succeeding pages (326–341) he developes the argument so fully that there is no occasion for going into details here. Cf. also Steuernagel, *op. cit.*, pp. 2f.; Meinhold, *op. cit.*, pp. 194ff.; and Nowack's excellent paper, "Deuteronomium und Regum" in *Vom Alten Testament* (Marti Festschrift, Beiheft *ZATW* No. 41, 1925), pp. 221–231.

[64] Jerome on Ezek. 1 1—accepting the year given in 2 Chron. 34 3—writes: "Duodecimo anno Josiae, quando inventus est liber Deuteronomii in templo Dei." (Quoted from Budde, *loc. cit.*, p. 178.)

with Deuteronomy. Now, all this is exactly dated[65] in the eighteenth year of Kind Josiah, i. e., in 621 B. C. This is in striking corroboration of the conclusions to which we have been led by the various lines of evidence hitherto followed.

As has been seen above,[66] the historicity of these chapters is seriously challenged by a number of scholars. Upon the answer to the question of their historical value depends much—but not all. Whatever doubts may be entertained upon the subject, it simply will not do to isolate the question of the historicity of 2 Kings 22f. as though their testimony were alone and unsupported. We have already seen that abundant independent evidence exists for placing Deuteronomy in this particular niche of literary and religious development. The broad sweep of Hebrew history reaffirms this conviction. Had 2 Kings 22f. never been written, we must nevertheless have ultimately—though, perhaps, not so soon—have come to the conclusion that Deuteronomy belongs somewhere in the last century of the existence of the southern kingdom.

But, as a matter of fact, our faith in the essential trust-worthiness of the record is abundantly justified by literary criticism. The editor of Kings seems to have used here an older written source clearly distinguishable in style and thought from his own writings. This was probably included in a pre-exilic history of the kings, and may well have been written by a contemporary of Josiah—almost certainly, in any case, before the catastrophe of 586 B.C.[67] The fact that the book of Kings in its final form is of later date does not necessarily stamp the account in these chapters as an invention. Nor does the evident working over of the Huldah oracle[68] overbear the evident soberness of the main story.[69] There is such a thing as an over-refined scepticism!

[65] 2 Kings 22 3. [66] Pp. 326ff.

[67] Moore, *loc. cit.*, col. 1080; Nowack, *loc. cit.*, pp. 228ff.; W. R. Smith and E. Kautzsch in *Enc. Bib.* II, col. 2671, article "Kings": "The details suggest that this source was based on official documents."

[68] 2 Kings 22 14ff.

[69] Cf. Gressmann, "Josia und das Deuteronomium" in *ZATW*, 1924, p. 321; Nowack, *loc. cit.*, pp. 227f.

Considerations of a literary, religious and historical character confirm us in placing Deuteronomy in the period immediately preceding 621 B. C. It remains to indicate concisely the elements of relative strength and weakness in the arguments adduced.

The argument from literary relationships, including style and vocabulary, seems well taken. Similarly, the reasoning based on the development of Hebrew religion appears sound. The argument founded on a general view of the progress of the history is also, apparently, well based. So far we stand on firm ground.

There are, however, two elements of possible weakness:

1) How are we to prove beyond the question of a doubt that the narrative of 2 Kings 22f. is historical? Or unhistorical, either, for that matter? Evidently reforms constitute excellent raw material for the legend-building fancy. There is also a suspicious similarity in the Old Testament records of reforms. That of Asa[70] is open to doubt, at least so far as some of its details are concerned. Apparently, too, the picture of Hezekiah's reform has been considerably retouched.[71] The account of the activity of Ezra, and in fact the Chronicler's record of that whole period of Jewish history, is of little historical worth.[72] In spite of all this, it would nevertheless seem that we must presuppose a historical basis for some at least of the traditions. Surely they are not all manufactured out of whole cloth. The reform of King Josiah seems better attested than most. Evidence has been given above to support the essential credibility of the narrative. The principal difficulty inheres in the lack of positive external evidence. But the balance of probability seems to be decidedly in favor of the general historicity of 2 Kings 22f. This once proved, the debate would seem to be unquestionably and finally settled in favor of the commonly accepted date of Deuteronomy.

[70] 1 Kings 15 9–15.

[71] 2 Kings 18; see especially the later insertions, vv. 4a and 22. Cf. G. A. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. XLIf.

[72] Cf. Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, pp. 223ff. "In general, it is evident that the Chronicler became an editor more from necessity than from choice. By taste and gift he was a novelist." (p. 250).

2) Another difficulty in reaching definite findings on the Deuteronomic question consists in the fact that we must posit both earlier and later material in the book. This element of confusion has been utilized to the full by recent critics of the accepted view. Some push the date backward, others pull it forward. The attempt to resolve the difficulty by utilizing as a clue the alternation of the singular and plural forms of the second personal pronoun must be regarded as quite unsuccessful.[73] "'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished" that this particular difficulty might be so ironed out as to lead to some agreement on the relative dates of the diverse elements composing the book.

Here, then, are two definite problems that still await solution. They stand as a challenge to Old Testament criticism. If the experience of the past is any criterion these problems, too, will in due time find their solution. It is, meanwhile, inspiring to believe that there is still ample occasion for the devoted labors of the critic. Almost one is persuaded to adopt as the exultant battle-cry of criticism the words of Isaiah 48 22 (very freely rendered!):

אֵין שָׁלוֹם אָמַר יְהוָה לָרְשָׁעִים

"There is no peace," saith Jehovah, "for the critics."

In spite of certain unresolved difficulties, it would seem that the preponderance of evidence is still in favor of that view of the date of Deuteronomy which has been established by many decades of laborious and brilliant research. Undoubtedly slight modifications in our views will require to be made from time to time. In this connection we are grateful for the new light cast upon the whole problem by the independent and stimulating investigations of men like Welch and Hölscher. The striking and encouraging reflection that emerges from the study of the views discussed in this Symposium is that the work of criticism has been in general on the right track, and that so little change is needed with regard to our view of the date of Deuteronomy.[74]

[73] As in the case of Steuernagel, *op. cit.*, pp. 9ff. See G. A. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. LXXIII; Meinhold, *op. cit.*, pp. 202f.

[74] Cf. Peake, *Recent Developments in Old Testament Criticism*, p. 28:

Quizzical Omar has an apt quatrain for those who, like ourselves, end where they begin:

> Myself when young did eagerly frequent
> Doctor and Saint, and heard great Argument
> About it and about; but evermore
> Came out by the same Door as in I went.[75]

And yet! Was it not perhaps worth while to examine the evidence anew?

"The net result of the recent critical movement, it seems to me, is that we are left in the main very much where we were a quarter of a century ago."

[75] *Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam*, XXVII, translated by Edward Fitzgerald.

SANBALLAT "THE HORONITE"

C. C. TORREY
YALE UNIVERSITY

THE incidents with which the following investigation is concerned belong to what was probably the most critical point in Jewish history; a time when it even seemed possible that the religious tradition of Jerusalem and Judea might be permanently broken off. If those who wished this could have had their way, the contribution of Hebrew thought and civilization to the world would have had an appearance far different from that which it now has. There would have been not only no "New Testament," but probably no "Old Testament" except the Pentateuch. The period concerned is one about which we have very little information; and the little that we have has been pretty thoroughly misunderstood. Some new and very important material came to light only a few years ago, but even this has been wrongly interpreted at one point of great significance.

In the last edition (the fourth) of Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments* Professor Hölscher, in discussing the Book of Nehemiah, remarks (p. 525) that one thing now made certain by the papyri from Elephantine is that the Persian king Artaxerxes under whom Nehemiah flourished was Artaxerxes I. Longimanus. This would mean that Nehemiah preceded, by more than thirty years, the letter of the Jews of Yeb to their brethren in Judea. The ground of this opinion, which seems to be widespread, is the single fact that there is mention of a Sanballat of Samaria in the papyrus letter, as also in the book of Nehemiah. This taken by

itself, however, is evidence of only the slightest value. There may have been more than one Sanballat of Samaria, just as there were numerous Nehemiahs in Judea and several Persian kings named Artaxerxes. It will presently be shown that we have clear testimony, of more than one variety and from more than one source, to the fact that Sanballat was a name recurring in the family which continued to hold the governorship of the Samaritan province. The important question, in comparing the famous papyri with the Biblical record, is in regard to the conditions in Palestine concerning which they give us information.

There is, and must be, general agreement on this important point, that at the time op the Elephantine correspondence the Samaritan schism had not taken place, and *there was no hostility between Jerusalem and Samaria.* Cowley, commenting on the letter, in his *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B. C.*, p. 110, states this clearly and forcibly. It is quite certain that in 408 B.C. Jews and Samaritans were on such friendly terms that the numbers of the community in upper Egypt (who of course were perfectly well informed) could take it for granted that they would cooperate. In the book of Nehemiah, on the contrary, we hear of plenty of trouble. It is precisely the sort of trouble that we find continuous in the later history, the cat-and-dog life of declared and neighboring enemies; that which we see in the time of the Chronicles, in Ben Sira, and in the New Testament. We know the reason of the mutual antagonism, and it was a reason which persisted, after the enmity had once been openly declared. Because of the conditions known to us, there could be little plausibility in the hypothesis that there were *two* periods of bitter hostility separated by an interval of friendly intercourse.

From the mere comparison of the documents thus far considered, then, we are justified in rejecting Hölscher's conclusion and substituting another. Whatever evidence is yielded by the Elephantine letter is very clearly to the effect that the Persian royal benefactor of Nehemiah was *not* Longimanus, but (as the massoretic tradition plainly has it) Artaxerxes II. Mnemon. The Sanballat with whose two sons, in charge of affairs at Samaria, the Jewish

authorities at Jerusalem were on good terms was *not* the Sanballat whom Nehemiah resisted, outwitted, and formally cursed.

Another problem enters at this point. What is to be done with the long and circumstantial account of the Samaritan schism and its attendant circumstances given by Josephus, *Antt.* XI, 7 2–8 4? To simply reject it as worthless without giving it any plausible explanation (as, for example, Hölscher does, *ibid.*, p. 561) is not a helpful proceeding. Did the Jewish tradition preserve *no* account, of which a Jewish historian would be aware, of this most momentous occurrence, in the historical setting with which it must always have been associated? Hölscher himself, in dealing with the subject of the sources used by Josephus, in his excellent article in the Pauly-Wissowa *Realencyclopädie*, s. v. "Josephus," shows the strong probability that the Jewish historian in this very portion of his work is drawing his material, at least indirectly, from Alexander Polyhistor. In the immediately preceding section, XI, 7, 1, Josephus has given us authentic information regarding affairs in Jerusalem, derived from his Greek source and treated in his own characteristic manner. There is no good reason to doubt, but every reason to believe—as Hölscher also implies—that in the following closely connected account, introducing Jaddua, Manasseh, Sanballat, and the arrival of Alexander the Great, he is using the same source and proceeding in the same manner. Recollect also the highly important fact that the Chronicler, in Neh. 12 11, 22, makes the high-priest Jaddua contemporaneous with Darius III Codomannus (see below). The Chronicler certainly had at hand reliable information thus far back, though his knowledge of earlier times, the chronology and history of the Persian period, seems to have been very slight.

Hölscher's attempt (in Kautzsch, p. 561) to discredit the account given by Josephus is not impressive. He finds in the recording of the names of the principal characters a suspicious circumstance (as though these could ever have been forgotten in Jerusalem!). The name Manasseh is familiar, and so is Nikaso ("gut griechisch"). "Solche Erfindung von Namen ist stets characteristisch für die jüngere Legende." That is, because the names

are otherwise well known they are unlikely to be genuine? In Pauly-Wissowa, *ibid.*, col. 1968, Hölscher expresses concisely his view of this chapter of the *Antiquities*. "Diese Erzählung ist eine ungeschichtliche gelehrte Legende, entstanden auf ägyptischem Boden (vgl. XI, 345). Sie kombiniert die zu Nehemiahs Zeit spielende Erzählung (Neh. 13 28ff.) mit dem um 400 amtierenden Hohenpriester Jaddua (Neh. 12 11, 22) und verlegt die ganze Geschichte in Alexanders Zeit (um 332). Eine richtige Erinnerung liegt insofern vor, als das samaritanische Schisma tatsächlich erst in makedonischer Zeit erfolgt sein kann."

As to this there are several things to be said. (1) The evidence of *Antt.* XI, 345 points in the direction opposite to that supposed by Hölscher. If the story of the soldiers of Sanballat's army settled in the Thebaid by Alexander is true, it is useless to conjecture where it was first recorded in writing. If it is not true, it is much more likely to have arisen in Palestine than in Egypt, where its falsity would have been well known. (2) We have no good reason to suppose that Jaddua was officiating as high-priest "um 400." Neh. 12 22 makes him a contemporary of Darius "the Persian", *ha-Parsī*, a name taken from the popular narratives of the great overturn in Western Asia, habitually contrasting the last of the Achaemenids with his opponent and conqueror, Alexander "the Macedonian," *ha-Yawānī*. Johanan, the father of Jaddua, was high-priest in the year 412, as we know from the Elephantine papyri, and Jaddua is represented as of venerable age in the days of Alexander (see *Antt.* XI, 347). We have no reason whatever to doubt that each of these two high-priests held the office for a long term, and there is no need to suppose, as some have done, that there was an intervening incumbent. (3) Josephus makes no use of the story told in Neh. 13 28ff. He could not "combine" it with the story of Jaddua and Alexander, for it stands plainly in the Jewish sacred scriptures as an event of the preceding generation, belonging to the personal achievements of the hero Nehemiah. Josephus would not have discredited his history by such a foolish and unnecessary duplication—even if the actual facts had not been well known to the Jewish people

of his day. It is the Chronicler, as I demonstrated in 1896 and have repeatedly argued since, who makes the duplication, rebuking the Samaritans by showing how Nehemiah had dealt with a similar case. He commits no anachronism in this (see my *Second Isaiah*, pp. 459f.), and has the (apparent) support of Nehemiah's own personal narrative. All through this 13th chapter the Chronicler is attacking, in the name of Nehemiah, the evils of his own day. When this fact is recognized, all the difficulties felt by Hölscher, Mowinckel, and others disappear in a flash, as do also the numerous interpolators, glossators, etc. who are postulated. Nehemiah's own account of his work ended in chapter 6, very likely at vs. 14 or vs. 15. Chapters 7–13 are entirely the composition of the Chronicler (chaps. 8–10 transferred by later hands from the book of Ezra), and have suffered only slight accidental corruption in their text since they left his hands. See my *Composition of Ezra-Nehemiah* (1896), pp. 35–49; *Ezra Studies* (1910), pp. 248–278, 328–331; *Second Isaiah* (1928), pp. 29f., 456–460. (4) Hölscher is certainly right in concluding that the Samaritan schism cannot have taken place before the Macedonian time.

Josephus' source, whatever it was, possessed true information as to the main events accompanying the arrival of the great Alexander at Jerusalem. His account of the final break between the Jews and the Samaritans, resulting in the building of a temple on Mount Gerizim, agrees perfectly in every essential detail with the information which we gain from the Old Testament and from the papyri of Elephantine. The schism took place in 332 B. C. Also, and with equal certainty, *we are shown two Sanballats at Samaria holding the office of governor.* One of them, not unfriendly to the Jews, was still alive, though an old man, in 408 B. C.; this is the Sanballat named in the letter from the Jews at Yeb, and not mentioned at all in the Old Testament. The other, an open and consistent enemy of the Jews, lived just two generations later; this is the Sanballat named in the book of Nehemiah, and in the account preserved by Josephus.

Why, now, does Nehemiah call his Sanballat "*the Horonite*?" As he uses this gentilic name in 2 19 we receive the distinct im-

pression of a term of reproach or contempt. No satisfactory explanation of the epithet has been given, however. In my *Second Isaiah*, p. 458, footnote, I wrote: "As to the origin of this nickname we shall probably continue to be in the dark;" I now believe, after further study, that the epithet can be accounted for in a very plausible way.

The opposition by Sanballat and his allies which Nehemiah had to meet is an essential and very conspicuous feature of his narrative. It was open and armed hostility, such that the city was in immediate danger. Jerusalem became a garrison, with its whole able-bodied population under arms. A watch was set night and day; the builders of the wall and the bearers of burdens kept each a weapon in one hand or within reach; Nehemiah had a trumpeter by his side, and exhorted the people to fight for their homes and for their wives and children. The enemy had planned a surprise attack: "They shall not know, nor see, till we come into the midst of them, and slay them" (4 11).

The state of things shown to us in this little record, the threat of an armed attack on Jerusalem by such an association of enemies as the one here named, points plainly to the 4th century. This could hardly have happened in the time of Longimanus, under whom the whole Transfluminal region was firmly held; nor indeed at any time in the long period during which a succession of governors under Persian appointment had charge of Jerusalem and Judea. It was in the later period, when Persia had lost Egypt and was holding Palestine in a relaxed grasp, under the weak and negligent rule of Artaxerxes Mnemon, that such disturbances would be likely to take place. The province of Judea was no longer under direct Persian control, at the time when Nehemiah received his surprising appointment. The office of Governor of Judea had been discontinued (presumably early in the reign of Mnemon, or even at its beginning?), and the only seat of the Persian administration of Palestine was at Samaria. Jerusalem and Samaria had long been jealous rivals, and now for the first time the northern capital had the opportunity to gain decisively the upper hand. It was not merely political control that was

aimed at; more important still was the religious primacy of Palestine, long coveted by Shechem (see Luther-Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme*, 543ff., 559). But how was this change to be brought about? The prestige of the temple at Jerusalem was a stubborn fact; it was not easy to see how it could be humbled—or destroyed. The nobles and priests of Judea were inclined to manage their own affairs, and well able to do so, especially in this time of quasi-independence; they would resist any interference. Open warfare, on some pretext, could always be brought about, but only as a last resort. The weapon within easiest reach was intrigue, aided occasionally by a veiled threat of possible force or of representations to be made at the Persian court (as in Neh. 2 19; 6 6f.). The emissaries of Samaria had been intriguing successfully before Nehemiah's arrival in the province. In Neh. 6 10, 12, 14 we hear of serious disaffection in Jerusalem, the result of bribery from without. Verses 17f., if they are from the hand of Nehemiah and not from that of the Chronicler, give even more startling information. Those who were plotting against the southern capital had gained their converts, and there certainly was some resulting consternation in the city.

One of the mischief-makers, and apparently the chief among them, was the Sanballat of Nehemiah and Josephus, *the grandson of the Sanballat of the Elephantine papyrus*. He was a young man with ambitions, who had been growing up at just the time when the rivalry was beginning to be serious. Now it is quite evident that Nehemiah's adversary *was not governor of Samaria at the time of these events*. Nothing in the record implies this, and the actual situation renders the supposition most improbable. Nehemiah came to Judea by royal appointment, as a favored personal attendant op the king; and he brought letters to the governors of the Transfluminal provinces, containing provision for his work of building. The governor of Samaria at the time of Nehemiah's arrival (384 B. C.) was presumably one of the two sons of the first Sanballat, most likely Delaiah, the first of the two to be named in the letter from Elephantine. From our knowledge of conditions in Palestine at this time it seems not unlikely that

he would have been willing to see Nehemiah's attempt fail, and even to see Jerusalem invaded. He himself could not, however, openly oppose the new governor of Judea. A member of his family, acting on his own responsibility, might do so, and this initiative was in fact taken by his son (possibly it was his nephew).

The younger Sanballat was a man to do things, not to throw curses from a distance; and here, I think, is to be found the explanation of the contemptuous epithet "Horonite," which Nehemiah bestows upon him. He had taken up his residence at Beth-horon, a little northwest of Jerusalem, with the express purpose of taking a hand in Jewish affairs. A glance at a map of Palestine, and especially a raised map or air-map, will show that this was a base of operations admirably suited to his purposes. On the direct road from Jerusalem to Lydda and the seacoast, he also had easy communication with Samaria and Shechem, and could conduct his operations either openly or in secret. He had a strong following and influential helpers, including even some of the Jewish notables. Jerusalem was in fact now threatened as at no other time since the Babylonian invasion. Some little clash might easily lead to armed conflict and then to actual warfare, in which the defenceless city would be sure to suffer terribly. The well-informed men of Jerusalem must for some time have seen what was coming, perhaps even before Sanballat moved to Beth-horon. The first verses of the story of Nehemiah, which have given rise to so much conjecture, are quite probably to be explained by this fact. Hanani and the men from Judea came to Nehemiah in Susa, and said to him: "The people there in the province are in great distress, and are held in contempt, for the wall of Jerusalem is broken down, and its gates are burned." This may indeed be a mere repetition of stock phrases, as I formerly thought (*Ezra Studies*, p. 334, footnote), but it now seems to me to be a report of immediate danger. The reproach of the ruined city wall was an old story; that which was new and alarming was the political situation. While a Persian governor was resident in the city there had been no need of fortification.

Nehemiah knew, when he set out for Palestine, that he was

going to have trouble. The foes of Jerusalem had been active for some time past, and the brethren who came to him from Judea had told him what was going on. In his account the enemy is simply taken for granted, first mentioned in 2 10 in a way that sounds almost casual. He had known about the hot-headed young man at Beth-horon. The latter, however, was taken by surprise, and he and his allies were unable to pull themselves together in time to make a winning move. They made a desperate, half prepared attempt to prevent the fortification, thus showing their purpose of future action, which was to put an end to the authority of Jerusalem. With the city walled, and the temple standing, Shechem and Samaria could not control Palestine. With the wall still breached, some future attack, when the time was ripe, might lay the temple in ruins, or even devastate the city. The ultimate objective of the Samaritan enemies was always *the temple*; the question of the city walls, though important, was incidental; Ezra 4 24 (written *after* the Samaritan schism) shows this plainly enough. Sanballat and his confederates were even now hoping that fortune might give them sufficient strength, or that Nehemiah and the Jews might show sufficient weakness, to enable them to strike the blow. If Jerusalem could thus be made powerless they would thenceforth have a clear field. The governor of Samaria could wash his hands of the matter (how could he know what was going on at Beth-horon?), and the Persian king would certainly accept the *fait accompli* and thank fortune that another problem was taken off his hands.

In spite of the threats of Sanballat and Tobiah the wall was repaired and the gates secured. Nehemiah was too wary, and his foes were not quite strong enough to venture an assault. We are told that "all the heathen round about were much cast down in their own eyes" (6 19), and this must have been true especially of their leaders. What, may we suppose, was the next step taken by "the Horonite?" A sentence in Josephus, generally passed by as worthless—and with good reason—may perhaps deserve consideration. He says that his Sanballat, "a Cuthean," was sent to Samaria as governor by Darius III. The gentilic adjective was

of course designed for disparagement, not to give information. 'Sent into the land by Darius' is more noticeable, and it possibly contains a grain of truth. Josephus makes mention of no Persian king between Artaxerxes II. and Darius Codomannus, and it seems most improbable that the latter, who reigned only three years, should have appointed Sanballat, who died at an advanced age in 332 (*Antt.* XI, 311, 325). Appointment by Artaxerxes III. Ochus, who came to the throne in 359, would seem in every way probable. If any weight can be given to the statement that this governor was 'sent to Samaria' by the king, we could infer from it that Nehemiah's enemy, after his failure at Jerusalem, removed to a distance and ultimately spent some years at the Persian court, engaged in such intrigues as he had carried on at Beth-horon, and at length receiving his commission directly from the king. This at any rate is precisely what he might have been expected to do. Whatever he may have planned or accomplished, however, either at the Persian capital or elsewhere, the course of events in Palestine turned against him and in favor of his rivals. The temple on Gerizim was built, but after Alexander's invasion of the land Jerusalem was never again in danger of a Samaritan attack, nor of yielding any of its prestige to the northern sanctuary.

BOOKS RECEIVED

The Second Isaiah. A New Interpretation. By Charles Cutler Torrey. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928. Pp. XII + 477. $ 5.—.

Professor Torrey maintains that chapters 34, 35, 40—66 of Isaiah constitute a group of 27 poems written by one author who lived in Palestine near the end of the 5th century B. C. His commentary is divided into three parts: (1), Literary and Critical Essays; (2), Translation, with Indication of Metric Form; and (3), Introduction and Notes to the Several Poems. The work is both scholarly and appreciative, and marks a notable advance in the study of the much abused and freely dismembered Second Isaiah. It is no exaggeration to say that this book is absolutely indispensable for anyone who seeks a true interpretation and worthy appreciation of these matchless poems.

What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays. By Hermann Gunkel. Translated by A. K. Dallas. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1928. Pp. 187. $ 1.50.

A translation of five essays by this celebrated German scholar. Besides the title essay there are papers on "Fundamental Problems of Hebrew Literary History," "The Religion of the Psalms," "The Close of Micah," and "Jacob." The book is dedicated as follows: "To the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, New York, as a Token of Respect and of Gratitude for the Honour Bestowed by Them on the Author."

A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel. By Abba Hillel Silver. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927. Pp. XV + 268. $ 3.50.

Justice and Judaism. By Maxwell Silver. New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1928. Pp. 73. $ 1.50.

Notes on St. Luke and the Acts. By Alex Pallis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1928. $ 1.—.

Le Décalogue. (Études d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses publiées par la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de l'Université de Strasbourg). By Sigmund Mowinckel. Paris: Librairie Felix Alcan, 1927. Pp. 162. 15 fr.

Excavations at Tell En-Nasbeh: 1926 and 1927. (Palestine Institute Publication, No. 1). By H. F. Badé. Berkeley, California: Professional Press, 1928. Pp. 56. $ 1.—.

Anti-Saloon League Year Book 1928. By Ernest H. Cherrington. Westerville, Ohio: American Issue Press, 1928. Pp. 224. $ 75.—.

Law in the Apocrypha (Columbia University Oriental Studies, Vol. XXVI). By Ralph Marcus. New York: Columbia University Press, 1927. Pp. XVI + 116. $ 2.50.

Reallexikon der Assyriologie. 1. Band, 1. Lieferung. *A-Altkleinasiatische Völker.* Edited by Erich Ebeling and Bruno Meissner. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1928. Pp. IX + 80 + 14 plates. M. 8.—.

Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann in Giessen:

Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels. (Beiheft zur ZATW, No. 48). By Kurt Galling, 1928. Pp. 96. M. 6.—.

Das Gebet der Angeklagten im Alten Testament. (Beiheft zur ZATW, No. 49). By Hans Schmidt, 1928. Pp. 46. M. 2.70.

Die Vorexilischen Gesetze Israels im Zusammenhang seiner kulturgeschichtlichen Entwicklung. (Beiheft zur ZATW, No. 50). By Abram Menes. 1928. Pp. 143. M. 8.—.

Das Räucheropfer im Alten Testament. Eine Archäologische Untersuchung. By Max Löhr. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1927. Pp. VIII + 37. M. 4.—.

PROCEEDINGS

DECEMBER 27th and 28th, 1927.

THE Sixty-third meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis was called to order by President I. F. Wood at 11 A. M. on December 27th, 1927 at Union Theological Seminary, New York.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved. The reports of the Recording Secretary and Corresponding Secretary were read and approved. To nominate officers for the coming year Professors Paton, Margolis and Kendrick were appointed. The President, Professor I. F. Wood, read his presidential address on "The Contribution of the Bible to the History of Religion." Papers were then read and discussed as follows:

By S. Zeitlin: "A Testimony unto them:" an Instance of the Importance of the Halakah for the Understanding of the Gospels.

By H. Branscomb: Jesus' Attitude to the Law of Moses.

By S. Cohen: The Double Line of Development of Eschatology in the O. T.

Tuesday Afternoon, December 27. The Society reconvened about 2:30. The symposium on Deuteronomy suggested last year had been planned by Professor J. A. Bewer, but his own paper on "The Early Date" had to be omitted by reason of his absence on account of illness. Professor G. Dahl spoke on "The Ordinarily Accepted Date," and Professor L. B. Paton on "The Late Date." A considerable discussion followed in which L. W. Batten, W. R. Arnold, J. A. Maynard, S. Cohen, K. Fullerton, M. L. Margolis, and others took part. Papers were read and discussed as follows:

By G. A. Barton: The Interpretation of ἱλαστήριον in Romans 3 25.

By C. C. Torrey: A Bit of Hebrew Mythology in Habbakuk 2 17.

By A. M. Perry: Streeter and Burton: a Study in the Synoptic Problem.

Tuesday Evening, December 27. The Society convened at 8 p. m. The session was held as a meeting of the Fund for Biblical

and Oriental Archaeological Research, with Professor Montgomery in the chair. The following papers illustrated with the stereopticon were presented:

By W. F. Badé: The Last Season's Work at Tell en-Nasbeh.
By R. Butin: The New Inscriptions from Sinai.
By R. P. Dougherty: A Neo-Babylonian Text Showing the Administrative Power of Belshazzar.

Wednesday Morning, December 28. The Society met at 9:30 a. m. The report of the Treasurer with that of a committee appointed to audit it was read and approved. The Report of the Council was presented by the Recording Secretary and was approved. The persons nominated for membership by the Council and some others nominated at this session were elected members. The following resolution introduced by Professor Montgomery was adopted:

> *Resolved*: That the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, assembled in Annual Meeting in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City, December 27, 1927, learns with pleasure of the coming International Old Testament Conference to be held in Bonn in August next in connection with the *Orientalistentag*, in which Conference the British Society for Old Testament Study will participate. We welcome this drawing together of the several national societies interested in Biblical Studies, and warmly recommend to our membership the opportunities for fellowship and stimulation offered by the coming Bonn Conference. And that a copy of this Minute be sent to Professor Paul Kahle, of the University of Bonn.

Announcement was made that a third, revised edition of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* was in preparation. The nominating committee made report and the officers named by them were elected for the year 1928. They are as follows:

Prof. L. W. Batten	*President*
Prof. J. E. Frame	*Vice-President*
Prof. Millar Burrows	*Treasurer*
Prof. H. J. Cadbury	*Recording Secretary*
Prof. H. C. Alleman	*Associates in Council*
Prof. Moses Bailey	*Associates in Council*
Prof. H. S. Gehman	*Associates in Council*
Prof. Solomon Zeitlin	*Associates in Council*
Prof. E. Olive Dutcher	*Associates in Council*

Prof. W. J. Moulton { *Representative among the Trustees of the American Schools of Oriental Research*

On behalf of the Trustees of the American Schools of Oriental Research, President Moulton made a brief report of the work and prospects of the schools. Papers were read and discussed as follows:

By J. A. Montgomery: Notes on the Kalammu Inscription: (a) a Biblical Parallel; (b) the Vocable hlpny(h)m.

By M. Burrows: The Voice from the Whirlwind.

By J. J. Obermann: Tracing the Mosaic Birth-Legend.

By J. Moffatt: The Bridal Metaphor in the N. T.

By H. L. Gordon: Multiple Names in the Bible

By B. A. Elzas: (1) A Note on 2 Samuel 12 31; (2) The Words *hesed* and *sedakah* in Hebrew.

By F. C. Porter: Does 2 Corinthians 5 16 imply that Paul knew the historical Jesus?

By S. J. Case: The Jewish Bias of Paul.

Wednesday Afternoon, December 28. The Society convened at 2:10 p. m. The Secretary was instructed by the Society to send a note of thanks to the officers of Union Theological Seminary for the courtesy of the hospitality which we have enjoyed. The following memorial minute prepared by Professor Fullerton was adopted:

> Henry Preserved Smith, one of the most honored members of our Society and its President in 1909, died on Feb. 26th, 1927, in the eightieth year of his age. He was born in Troy, Ohio, October 23, 1847, a descendant of one of the finest and oldest of our New England strains. He graduated from Amherst College in 1869, and in 1872 from Lane Theological Seminary, in which his family had always taken a great and helpful interest. He studied at Berlin in 1873, and at Leipzig under the elder Delitzsch in 1876. He was instructor in Church History at Lane in 1874 to 1875 and Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in the same Institution from 1877 to 1893. After an interval of five years, he became Professor of Biblical Literature and College Pastor at Amherst (1898–1906), then Professor of the History of Religions at Meadville Theological Seminary (1907–1913), and from 1913 to 1925, in the Indian Summer of his days, he was the Librarian of Union Theological Seminary, bearing at the same time the title of Davenport Professor of Hebrew

and the Cognate Languages. His name thus became fittingly associated with the distinguished names of the preceding incumbents of that chair, Edward Robinson, Charles Augustus Briggs, and Francis Brown.

Professor Smith was an occasional contributor to the JOURNAL of our Society, delivered the Presidential address on "Old Testament Ideals" at the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the Society in 1909 and prepared, at the request of the Society, the very valuable list of Biblical Manuscripts in America (Vol. XLII, 1923). While Professor Smith was not a prolific writer of books, those which he did write have reflected distinction upon American Scholarship. The more important among them are his well-known *Commentary on Samuel* in the International Critical Commentary (1889), The *Bible and Islam* (1897), *Old Testament History* (1903), *Religion of the Old Testament* (1914), *Essays in Biblical Interpretation* (1921), and the brief but exceedingly interesting autobiographical sketch, *A Heretic's Defense* (1926).

This little book describes the one great dramatic episode in the otherwise quiet life of a scholar, and when read attentively is a remarkable revelation of Professor Smith's fineness of character. It gives a brief but authentic history of the writer's part in the famous Briggs-Smith heresy trials which shook the Presbyterian Church to its foundations some thirty-five years ago and attracted the widest attention throughout the country. These trials were of very great importance, for through them the results of the critical investigations of the Bible, principally in Germany, during the Nineteenth Century for the first time emerged beyond the classrooms of a few teachers and began to claim, in a most dramatic way, the attention of the general public. They also probably contributed more than any other single influence to the adoption by the great majority of our American Scholars of the historical method of research as applied to the study of the Scriptures.

Professor Smith played a somewhat less conspicuous part in these trials than did his friend, Professor Briggs, but it was no less effective. Professor Smith might easily have avoided the debate precipitated by Dr. Briggs, but loyalty to his friend, love of fair-play, and a deep sense of the importance of the debate for the spiritual welfare of the Church, as he believed, prevented him from taking the easy course of remaining silent. The result of the trials was to affect the whole subsequent period of his life more profoundly and to occasion, for personal reasons, more immediate disappointment and sorrow than was probably the case in the fortunes of his co-defendant, trying as the experiences of the latter also were. Yet his autobiography

shows not a trace of bitterness. Its objectivity is the objectivity of the true scholar. Though he is narrating events in which his own feelings were deeply stirred, there is not a trace of rhetoric or exaggeration, nor any attempt to play up the heroism of his decision, heroic though that decision undoubtedly was. He discusses the whole affair in which the fortunes of his life were so deeply involved with the scrupulous accuracy and objectivity with which he discussed the literary or historical problems in the book of Samuel. This character of his narrative is not due simply to the fact that a generation had elapsed since his trial had occurred; it is rather the expression of the innate quality of the man himself.

An allusion to this episode in Professor Smith's life is not intended to stir up again the passions of those far off days. But not to refer to Professor Smith's brave fight for intellectual and spiritual liberty, to the magnanimity which he always showed toward those with whom he differed, and to the fortitude with which he bore the severe consequences of his decision to support Dr. Briggs would be to ignore the most important event in his life, in which his true character as man and scholar stands out most conspicuously; it would be to forget the heroic rôle he played in one of the real turning-points in the history of American biblical scholarship, the effect of which upon the lives of all of us who are seeking after truth as best we can must be permanently inspiring. In the death of Professor Smith this Society is conscious of losing not only one of the finest of its scholars but also a great-souled man.

During the latter part of this session the Society divided into two sections, one for the Old Testament and one for the New. Papers were read and discussed as follows:

By K. Fullerton: Notes on Isaiah 8 11–15.
By H. Comins: Isaiah 9 5–6 and Hammurapi.
By G. Jeshurun: A Note on Zech. 13 7.
By M. S. Enslin: The Ascension Story.
By R. H. Pfeiffer: Three Assyriological Footnotes to the O. T.
By B. W. Bacon: Some Western Variants in the Text of Acts.
By H. J. Cadbury: The Odor at Pentecost in Acts 2 2.
By D. W. Riddle: The Non-Septuagint Element in the Vocabulary of Paul.
By H. S. Gehman: The Armenian Version of Daniel and its Affinities.
By G. S. Duncan: The Biblical and the Evolutionary Origin of Evil.
By S. Cohen: A Note on the Name "Maccabee."

The following papers were read by title:

By C. C. Torrey: Isaiah 65 25, "But dust shall be the serpent's food."

By N. Reich: Biblical and Other Ancient Places of Refuge.

By J. A. Maynard: The Development of "J."

By I. Eitan: (1) The Meaning of *tishkah yemini*, Psalm 137 5. (2) An Unknown Element in Prov. 27 19. (3) A phonological Rule for the Explanation of Morphological Monstrosities.

By W. N. Stearns: Some Local Millenarian Ideas.

By E. B. Christie: The Strophe Arrangement of the *Benedicite*.

Adjourned at 4:30 p. m.

HENRY J. CADBURY, *Recording Secretary*.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY

The Editors of the Journal report the completion of the volume for the current year (XLVI). A number of valuable articles have been printed. Contributors are still asked to exercise patience in view of the delays incident to printing abroad. Papers of interest and merit are always welcome. The cooperation of members is urged to the end that the official organ of the Society may still maintain the high standards of preceding years.

December 27, 1928.

George Dahl, *Corresponding Secretary.*

REPORT OF THE RECORDING SECRETARY

To the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis:

The apparent active membership of the Society at the close of the present year numbers 409, which is 13 more than last year. 37 persons elected to membership a year ago have been qualified as members of the Society.

Information has been received of the death of the following active members:

Henry Preserved Smith, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., died Feb. 26, 1927.
D. D. Luckenbill, Chicago, died June 5, 1927.
W. Muss-Arnolt, New York, died June 24, 1927.
Edward I. Bosworth, Oberlin, Ohio, died July 1, 1927.
Edward B. Pollard, Chester, Penna., died July 12, 1927.
Miß Ettalene M. Grice, New Haven, died Dec. 4, 1927.

Professor Hugo Gressmann of Berlin was elected an honorary member of the Society at our last meeting. He came to this country early in the year, and died in Chicago on April 7.

December 24, 1927.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry J. Cadbury, *Recording Secretary.*

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS TREASURER'S REPORT FOR 1927

Receipts

Balance forward	$ 2713.73
Dues	1201.74
Interest	119.91
Yale Press	537.48
Reprints	18.—
Corrections	2.25
	$ 4593.11

Disbursements

Drugulin, printing *Journal*, volume XLV, parts 3–4, XLVI, parts 1–2	$ 1303.54
J. C. Winston Co.	25.—
J. J. McDevitt	3.25
Editorial expenses	121.51
Secretary's expenses	27.86
Stenographic & clerical work	16.42
Postage, stationery, printing	29.48
Member's check returned	3.—
Refund to member for overpayment	4.—
	$ 1534.06
Balance	3059.05
	$ 4593.11

The Balance on hand is divided as follows:

Account in R. I. Hospital Trust Co., Providence, R. I.	$ 906.05
,, ,, New First National Bank, Meadville, Pa.	2150.—
Undeposited check	3.—
	$ 3059.05

Respectfully submitted

MILLAR BURROWS, *Treasurer.*

This certifies that the accounts of Millar Burrows as treasurer of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis for 1926–1927 were examined at the annual meeting in December 1927 and found correct.

GEORGE R. BERRY

MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY[1]

HONORARY MEMBERS

Prof. K. Budde, D. D., Marburg, Germany.
Prof. F. C. Burkitt, M. A., Cambridge, England.
Prof. Gustav Dalman, Theol. D., Greifswald, Germany.
Prof. Ernst von Dobschütz, D. D., Halle, Germany.
Prof. Hermann Gunkel, D. Theol., Halle, Germany.
Prof. Adolf von Harnack, D. D., Berlin, Germany.
Prof. A. Jülicher, D. D., Marburg, Germany.
Prof. Rudolf Kittel, D. D., Leipzig, Germany, Rosenthalgasse 13.
Prof. Marie Joseph Lagrange, Jerusalem (care of M. Gabalda, 90 Rue Bonaparte, Paris).
Prof. A. H. Sayce, D. D., Oxford, England.
Prof. G. A. Smith, D. D., Aberdeen, Scotland.

ACTIVE MEMBERS[2]

(693) '22 Rev. G. Abbott-Smith, D. D., D. C. L., 3473 University St., Montreal, Canada.
(593) '20 Prof. Arthur Adams, Ph. D., Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
(242) '92 Pres. Cyrus Adler, Ph. D., 2041 North Broad St., Phila., Pa.
(731) '22 Rev. Abel Ahlquist, 19 Bassett St., New Britain, Conn.
(576) '17 Wm. Foxwell Albright, Ph. D., American School of Oriental Research, P. O. B. 333, Jerusalem, Palestine.
(466) '11 Prof. Herbert C. Alleman, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.
(415) '07 Prof. Frederick L. Anderson, D. D., Newton Centre, Mass.
(711) '22 Rev. Prof. S. Angus, Ph. D., St. Andrew's College, Sydney, Australia.

[1] This list has been corrected up to May 1, 1928. Members are requested to notify the Recording Secretary, H. J. Cadbury, Bryn Mawr, Pa., of any change of address.

[2] The two numbers prefixed to the name of each member indicate the order and date of his accession to membership in the Society.

(305) '96 Prof. Wm. R. Arnold, Ph. D., 17 Francis Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
(724) '22 Prof. J. C. Ayer, 200 St. Mark's Sqr., Philadelphia, Pa.
(901) '28 Rev. Otto J. Baab, M. A., 5815 Drexel Ave., Chicago, Ill.
(184) '88 Prof. B. W. Bacon, D. D., 244 Edwards St., New Haven, Conn.
(373) '04 Dean Wm. Frederic Badé, Ph. D., D. D., Litt. D., Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal.
(690) '22 Prof. Moses Bailey, Ph. D., 6 Norfolk Terrace, Wellesley, Mass.
(712) '21 Lieut. C. C. Baker, 719 National City Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.
(722) '22 Prof. J. F. Balzer, M. A., Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
(825) '26 Albert E. Barnett, 1032 18th Ave. S., Nashville, Tenn.
(210) '91 Prof. George A. Barton, Ph. D., N. E. Cor. 43rd and Spruce Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
(211) '91 Prof. L. W. Batten, Ph. D., 6 Chelsea Sq., N. Y. City.
(902) '28 Prof. H. M. Battenhouse, State College, Pa.
(561) '16 Prof. John W. Beardslee, Jr., Ph. D., D. D., Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.
(828) '26 Prof. Dwight M. Beck, S. T. B., Mt. Union College, Alliance, Ohio.
(694) '22 Prof. Irwin R. Beiler, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
(829) '26 Miss Marion J. Benedict, Ph.D., Sweetbriar College, Sweetbriar, Va.
(718) '22 Rev. C. D. Benjamin, Ph. D., Somerton, Philadelphia, Pa.
(568) '16 Rev. C. Theodore Benze, Lutheran Seminary, Mt. Airy, Pa.
(830) '26 Rev. J. Buchanan Bernardin, B. D., 600 W. 122nd St., N. Y. City.
(326) '99 Prof. George R. Berry, D. D., Colgate Univ., Hamilton, N. Y.
(318) '98 Prof. Julius A. Bewer, Ph.D., D.D., Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
(618) '21 Pres. James A. Blaisdell, Pomona College, Claremont, Cal.
(551) '15 Rev. Joshua Bloch, Ph. D., 476 Fifth Ave., N. Y. City.
(843) '26 F. D. Bone, Akademischer Austauschdienst, Schloss, Portal 3, Berlin C 2, Germany.
(795) '25 Prof. Clarence Bouma, A. M., Th. D., Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich.
(887) '27 Rev. Boone M. Bowen, Scaritt College, Nashville, Tenn.
(423) '08 Prof. Clayton R. Bowen, Th. D., 5657 Woodlawn Ave., Chicago, Ill.
(370) '03 Rev. Lester Bradner, Ph. D., 302 Angell St., Providence, R. I.
(903) '28 Prof. Harvie Branscomb, Duke University, Durham, N. C.
(311) '97 Miss Emilie Grace Briggs, Hotel Holley, Washington Square West, New York City.

(831) '26 Rev. Mitchell Bronk, D. D., 1701 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
(569) '16 Mrs. Beatrice A. Brooks, Ph. D., Wellesley, Mass.
(870) '27 W. Rolfe Brown, Johannesstift, Artilleriestrasse 15, Berlin N. 24, Germany.
(719) '22 Prof. Walter E. Bundy, Ph. D., De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.
(586) '18 Prof. Ernest Ward Burch, Ph. D., Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
(871) '27 Rev. Joseph Dunn Burrell, D. D., 502 W. 122nd St., N. Y. City.
(747) '23 Prof. Millar Burrows, B. D., Ph. D., Brown University, Providence, R. I.
(554) '15 Prof. R. Butin, S. M., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
(589) '18 Prof. Moses Buttenwieser, Ph. D., 252 Loraine Ave., Clifton, Cincinnati, O.
(471) '11 Prof. Henry J. Cadbury, Ph. D., Bryn Mawr, Pa.
(904) '28 Prof. J. Y. Campbell, 2116 Edwards Hall, New Haven, Conn.
(631) '21 Rev. James T. Carlyon, S.T.M., D.D., Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Col.
(784) '24 Mr. L. L. Carpenter, B. A., Th. D., 714 Augusta St., Greenville, S. C.
(821) '25 Prof. J. F. B. Carruthers, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Calif.
(392) '06 Prof. Shirley J. Case, Ph. D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(222) '91 Rev. James L. Cheney, Ph. D., Hebron, Ohio.
(595) '20 Prof. Edward Chiera, Ph. D., 2022 S. 16th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
(896) '27 Rev. Elmer B. Christie, B. D., The Vicarage, Okanogan, Wash.
(369) '03 Prof. Calvin M. Clark, Bangor Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.
(523) '14 C. P. Coffin, 2304 Park Place, Evanston, Ill.
(606) '20 Rabbi Simon Cohen, Temple Beth El, 4 E. 76th St., N. Y. City.
(686) '22 Rabbi Simon R. Cohen, 75 Prospect Park West, Brooklyn, N. Y.
(899) '27 Harry Comins, 55 Elizabeth St., Hartford, Conn.
(662) '22 David C. Cook, Elgin, Ill.
(615) '21 Rev. Francis T. Cooke, 31 Maple St., Bristol, Conn.
(582) '18 Rev. George S. Cooke, Wissahickon Inn, Redlands, Calif.
(390) '06 Rev. Wm. M. Crane, Ph. D., Richmond, Mass.
(296) '96 Prof. Harlan Creelman, Ph. D., 118 North St., Auburn, N.Y.
(796) '25 Rev. Margaret B. Crook, 11 Jewett St., Northampton, Mass.
(759) '24 Prof. Earle B. Cross, Ph. D., 136 Harvard St., Rochester, N. Y.
(905) '28 Rev. Frank Monroe Crouch, 652 W. 189th St., New York City.
(819) '25 Prof. A. J. Culler, B. D., Ph. D., Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio.

(498) '13 Prof. D. E. Culley, Ph. D., 57 Belvidere St., Crafton, Pittsburgh, Pa.
(832) '26 A. Bruce Curry, Ph. D., Union Theol. Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., N. Y. City.
(739) '23 Prof. Muriel Streibert Curtis, B. D., Wellesley, Mass.
(401) '07 Prof. Elizabeth Czarnomska, Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va.
(499) '13 Prof. Geo. Dahl, Ph. D., 2102 Yale Sta., New Haven, Conn.
(797) '25 Prof. H. E. Dana, Th. D., Seminary Hill, Texas.
(645) '21 Miss Clara W. Davidson, Pleasantville, Venango Co., Pa.
(526) '15 Prof. Israel Davidson, 531 W. 123d St., N. Y. City.
(451) '10 Prof. Richard Davidson, Ph. D., 75 Queen's Park, Toronto, Can.
(705) '22 M. E. Davis, Th. M., D. D., Box 178, Brownwood, Tex.
(906) '28 Rev. Edward Day, Duncan Field Library, San Antonio, Tex.
(500) '13 Prof. Frank Leighton Day, Ashland, Va.
(458) '10 Prof. Thomas F. Day, 1648 S. A. Ave., San Anselmo, Calif.
(633) '21 Prof. John Pitt Deane, M. A., Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
(524) '14 Prof. Irwin Hoch DeLong, Ph. D., 523 West James St., Lancaster, Pa.
(121) '84 Prof. F. B. Denio, D. D., Bangor, Me.
(817) '25 Rev. W. B. Denny, S. T. M., 245 Pawling Ave., Troy, N. Y.
(723) '22 Prof. H. T. De Wolfe, D. D., Acadia Univ., Wolfville, N. S., Canada.
(600) '20 Rev. Samuel Dickey, Oxford, Pa.
(619) '21 Rev. Prof. Charles Allen Dinsmore, 10 Old Hartford Turnpike, New Haven, Conn.
(417) '07 Prof. Winfred N. Donovan, Newton Centre, Mass.
(596) '20 Prof. R. P. Dougherty, 319 Willow St., New Haven, Conn.
(823) '26 Prof. C. C. Douglas, Ph. D., 902 W. 37th St., Los Angeles, Calif.
(833) '26 Rev. Prof. John Dow, M. A., 75 Queen's Park, Toronto, Can.
(634) '22 Rev. Benj. R. Downer, Th. D., 1043 Laurel Ave., Kansas City, Kansas.
(664) '22 Rev. George H. Driver, 20 Birch Ave., Ellsworth, Maine.
(872) '27 Rev. Anson M. DuBois, M. A., Th. M., 715 Peterson, St., Fort Collins, Colo.
(620) '21 Prof. William Haskell Dubose, University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.
(760) '24 Prof. George S. Duncan, 2900 Seventh St. N. E., Washington.
(382) '05 Prof. E. Olive Dutcher, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
(666) '21 Prof. Frank Eakin, Ph. D., Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pa.

(402) '07 Prof. Burton S. Easton, Ph. D., 4 Chelsea Sq., New York City.
(844) '26 Miss Louise Eby, B. D., Grosvenor Hotel, 19 Grosvenor St., Edinburgh, Scotland.
(464) '10 Prof. Charles C. Edmunds, Gen. Theol. Seminary, Chelsea Sq., N. Y. City.
(898) '27 Rev. Frank L. Edwards, B. D., Highland, Ill.
(888) '27 Dean G. D. Edwards, A. M., Columbia, Mo.
(364) '03 Dean F. C. Eiselen, Garrett Bibl. Inst., Evanston, Ill.
(673) '22 Israel Eitan, 270 N. Craig St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
(612) '21 Rev. Barnett A. Elzas, A. B., M. D., LL. D., 42 W. 72nd St., New York.
(761) '24 Rabbi H. G. Enelow, D. D., 521 Fifth Ave., N. Y. City.
(403) '07 Prof. Henry Englander, 904 Lexington Ave., Cincinnati, O.
(745) '23 Prof. Morton Scott Enslin, Th. D., 4 Seminary Ave., Chester, Pa.
(263) '94 Pres. Milton G. Evans, D. D., Crozer Theol. Sem., Chester, Pa.
(799) '25 Prof. H. R. Fairclough, Ph. D., Litt. D., Box 753, Amherst, Mass.
(800) '25 David E. Faust, B. D., 51 1/2 Trumbull Str., New Haven, Conn.
(753) '23 S. Feigin, 135 S. Aiken Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa.
(735) '23 Pres. Carl A. Felt, The Peking Theol. Sem., Peking, China.
(862) '26 Floyd V. Filson, 2330 N. Halsted St., Chicago, Ill.
(762) '24 Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, 531 W. 123rd St., N. Y. City.
(873) '27 Prof. Elmer E. Flack, Th. D., 503 E. McCreight Ave., Springfield, Ohio.
(763) '24 Rev. John W. Flight, Ph. D., 2163 Yale Sta., New Haven, Conn.
(578) '17 Rev. Robert B. B. Foote, East Norwalk, Conn.
(874) '27 Bliss Forbush, Park Ave. and Laurens St., Baltimore, Md.
(629) '21 Rev. Donald F. Forrester, B. D., Ph. D., 175 Ninth Ave., N. Y. City.
(441) '08 Dean H. E. W. Fosbroke, General Theological Seminary, Ninth Ave. & 20th St., New York City.
(587) '18 Rabbi Solomon Foster, B. A., 90 Treacy St., Newark, N. J.
(875) '27 Prof. William M. Fouts, Th. D., 3040 W. Washington Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
(298) '96 Prof. Henry T. Fowler, Ph. D., Brown Univ., Providence, R. I.
(814) '25 Rabbi Leon Fram, Congregation Beth El, Woodward at Gladstone, Detroit, Mich.
(312) '97 Prof. James E. Frame, Union Theol. Sem., N. Y. City.
(418) '07 Prof. D. J. Fraser, Presbyterian College, Montreal, Can.
(671) '22 Rabbi Samuel Fredman, 6046 Washington Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.

(789) '24 Miss Estelle Freeman, 26 Craigmillar Park, Edinburgh, Scotland.
(752) '23 W. W. Freeman, Th. M., State Teachers College, Commerce, Texas.
(541) '15 Prof. Leslie E. Fuller, Ph. D., Garrett Bibl. Inst., Evanston, Ill.
(366) '03 Prof. Kemper Fullerton, Oberlin Theol. Sem., Oberlin, O.
(764) '24 Prof. Frank Gavin, Th. D., General Theol. Sem., N. Y. City.
(765) '24 Henry S. Gehman, Ph. D., S. T. D., 5720 N. Sixth St., Philadelphia, Pa.
(889) '27 Miss Katy Boyd George, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
(750) '23 Rev. Ralph William George, S. T. B., 48 Flint St., Somerville, Mass.
(876) '27 Prof. W. C. Gibbs, B. D., Columbia, Mo.
(198) '89 Prof. George W. Gilmore, 354 Fourth Ave., N. Y. City.
(766) '24 Prof. Louis Ginzberg, Ph. D., 531 W. 123rd St., N. Y. City.
(801) '25 Rev. C. E. Goddard, Ph. D., Independence, Mo.
(907) '28 Miss Beatrice L. Goff, A. B., 15 Leighton Road, Wellesley, Mass.
(866) '27 Rabbi Israel Goldstein, M. A., 233 W. 83rd St., New York City.
(794) '24 Rev.E.R. Goodenough, D.Phil., Woodbridge, NewHaven, Conn.
(340) '00 Prof. Edgar J. Goodspeed, Ph.D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(447) '09 Prof. Alex. R. Gordon, Litt. D., Presbyterian College, Montreal, Can.
(867) '27 Supt. Hirsch L. Gordon, Ph. D., L. H. D., 131 Johnson Ave., Newark, N. J.
(162) '86 Prof. R. J. H. Gottheil, Ph. D., Columbia Univ., N. Y. City.
(635) '21 Prof. William C. Graham, S. T. M., Faculty Exchange, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(384) '05 Prof. Elihu Grant, Ph. D., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
(621) '21 Dean Frederick C. Grant, Ph. D., 2145 Orrington Ave., Evanston, Ill.
(678) '22 Rev. Oscar F. Green, P. O. Box 322, Palo Alto, Calif.
(877) '27 Rev. Caspar R. Gregory, Auburn Theol. Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.
(646) '21 Rev. Frank H. Hallock, D. D., Seabury Divinity School, Faribault, Minn.
(647) '21 F. Watson Hannan, S. T. D., Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
(923) '28 Prof. E. E. Harkness, B.D., Ph.D., Crozer Seminary, Chester, Pa.
(728) '22 Victor E. Harlow, M. A., Oklahoma City, Okla.
(818) '25 Rev. F. D. Harris, 2138 Central Ave, Detroit, Mich.

(119) '84 Prof. J. R. Harris, Litt. D., 210 Bristol Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham, England.
(834) '26 Rev. R. S. Haupert, Moravian College and Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa.
(668) '22 Prof. Charles A. Hawley, Ph. D., Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
(648) '21 Prof. Howell M. Haydn, B. D., 1832 Rosemont Road, East Cleveland, Ohio.
(322) '98 Rev. Henry H. Haynes, Ph. D., Derry Village, N. H.
(503) '13 Prof. Charles B. Hedrick, Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.
(124) '84 Rev. C. R. Hemphill, D. D., Louisville, Ky.
(577) '17 Prof. Ralph K. Hickok, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y.
(890) '27 Prof. J. H. Hicks, A. B., B. D., 3548 Roberts Ave., Dallas, Tex.
(454) '10 Prof. W. Bancroft Hill, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
(434) '08 Prof. Wm. J. Hinke, Ph. D., 156 North St., Auburn, N. Y.
(659) '21 Rev. Chas. T. Hock, 222 Liberty St., Bloomfield, N. J.
(354) '02 Rev. Richard M. Hodge, D. D., 606 W. 116th St., N. Y. City.
(802) '25 Rev. Ernest G. Hoff, Ph.D., 22 S. State St., Elgin, Ill.
(563) '16 Rev. Louis H. Holden, Ph.D., 1 Richardson St., New Brunswick, N. J.
(836) '26 Miss Louise P. Holden, Stuart Hall, Staunton, Va.
(427) '08 Rev. Ivan L. Holt, 5068 Washington Blvd., St. Louis, Mo.
(539) '15 Prof. Lynn H. Hough, Central M. E. Church, Detroit, Mich.
(304) '96 Rt. Rev. Hiram R. Hulse, S.T.D., 15th and 8th Sts., Havana, Cuba.
(439) '08 Prof. Mary I. Hussey, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
(452) '10 Prof. Henri Hyvernat, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
(858) '26 Dean Clyo Jackson, St. Stephen's College, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.
(559) '16 Prof. F. J. Foakes Jackson, Union Theol. Sem., N. Y. City.
(679) '22 Prof. Fleming James, Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.
(827) '26 Prof. R. A. Jernberg, 1526 W. 45th St., Los Angeles, Calif.
(891) '27 Dr. George Jeshurun, 1366 55th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
(386) '05 Prof. James R. Jewett, Ph. D., 44 Francis Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
(864) '27 Clarence Richard Johnson, 2921$^1/_2$ S. Hoover St., Los Angeles, Calif.
(485) '12 Miss Harriet E. Johnson, 32 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.
(636) '21 Pres. William H. Johnson, Ph. D., D. D., Lincoln University, Pa.

(865) '27 Prof. M. M. Kaplan, 1 W. 89th St., New York City.
(878) '27 Rev. Francis L. Keenan, St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass.
(151) '86 Prof. M. L. Kellner, D. D., 3 Concord Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
(592) '20 Rev. Edwin H. Kellogg, Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, N.Y.
(660) '22 Prof. Fred T. Kelly, 2019 Monroe St., Madison, Wis.
(725) '22 Prof. Alexander P. Kelso, B. Sc., Southwestern Presb. Univ., Memphis, Tenn.
(338) '00 Pres. James A. Kelso, Ph. D., 725 Ridge Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa.
(438) '08 Prof. Eliza H. Kendrick, Ph. D., Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
(649) '21 Rev. Paca Kennedy, D. D., Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va.
(892) '27 Rev. Robert O. Kevin, 4221 Osage Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
(895) '27 Rev. Carl H. King, 301 Orchard St., New Haven, Conn.
(908) '28 Rev. G. B. King, B. D., Ph. D., Islington, Ontario, Canada.
(852) '26 Prof. Edward H. Knight, D. D., 71 Tremont St., Hartford, Conn.
(544) '15 Prof. Carl S. Knopf, Univ. of Southern Calif., Los Angeles, Calif.
(460) '10 Rev. Raymond C. Knox, Columbia Univ., N. Y. City.
(909) '28 George Alexander Kohut, 1 W. 70th St., New York City.
(767) '24 Rev. Carl H. Kraeling, 7301 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
(518) '14 Rev. Emil G. H. Kraeling, 531 E. 18th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
(879) '27 Rev. Robert M. Kurtz, 8 E. Westervelt Ave., Tenafly, N. J.
(473) '11 Rev. M. G. Kyle, D. D., Xenia Theol. Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.
(519) '14 Prof. Elbert C. Lane, Hartford Theol. Sem., Hartford, Conn.
(880) '27 Prof. Frank G. Lankard, 1909 Maple Ave., Evanston, Ill.
(910) '28 Paul F. Laubenstein, S. T. M., 547 Riverside Drive, Apt. 2 D., New York City.
(755) '23 Rev. P. A. Laury, D. D., 243 E. Garrison St., Bethlehem, Pa.
(743) '23 Prof. Darwin Ashley Leavitt, B.D., 641 Church St., Beloit, Wis.
(665) '21 Prof. Elmer A. Leslie, 228 Mason Terrace, Brookline, Mass.
(769) '24 Rabbi Leon Liebreich, M. A., 640 W. State St., Trenton, N. J.
(622) '21 Miss Grace Lockton, 107 W. 3rd St., Frederick, Md.
(372) '04 Prof. Lindsay B. Longacre, 2273 S. Fillmore St., Denver, Colo.
(674) '22 Mrs. Mary B. Longyear, 60 Leicester Ter., Brookline, Mass.
(845) '26 Rev. Arnold E. Look, M. A., Th. M., Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield, Mass.
(715) '22 Prof. William J. Lowstuter, 72 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
(720) '22 Prof. Nils W. Lund, Th. M., North Park College, Chicago, Illinois.

(590) '18 Mrs. Eugene W. Lyman, Union Theol. Sem., Broadway at 120th, N. Y. City.
(71) '82 Prof. D. G. Lyon, 12 Scott St., Cambridge, Mass.
(324) '26 Prof. W. Vernon Lytle, Ph. D., De Pauw Univ., Greencastle, Ind.
(847) '26 S. V. McCasland, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.
(721) '22 Prof. W. H. McClellan, S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.
(536) '15 Prof. C. C. McCown, Ph. D., D. D., Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal.
(881) '27 Rev. Walter T. McCree, M. A., Streetsville, Ontario, Canada.
(319) '98 Prof. John E. McFadyen, United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland.
(300) '96 Pres. Arthur C. McGiffert, D. D., Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
(650) '21 Pres. John McNaugher, D. D., LL. D., Pittsburgh Theological Sem., Pittsburgh, Pa.
(424) '08 Prof. J. Gresham Machen, 39 Alexander Hall, Princeton Sem., Princeton, N. J.
(637) '21 Rev. Edward Mack, D. D., 4 Westwood Avenue, Richmond, Va.
(804) '25 Rev. John V. Madison, B. D., M. A., Holstein, Iowa.
(742) '23 Prof. J. R. Mantey, Th. D., 3034 W. Wash. Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
(837) '26 Ralph Marcus, 276 Haven Ave., N. Y. City.
(681) '22 Rabbi Elias Margolis, Ph. D., 16 Glen Ave., Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
(516) '13 Prof. Max L. Margolis, Ph. D., Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
(853) '26 John Martin, Esq., North Adams, Mass.
(545) '15 Prof. Alexander Marx, Ph. D., 531 W. 123d St., N. Y. City.
(911) '28 Rev. Thomas B. Mather, Th. D., 419 E. Capital, Jefferson City, Mo.
(505) '13 Rev. Walter A. Mátos, Swarthmore, Pa.
(860) '26 Prof. Takuo Matsumoto, Aoyama Gakuin Theol. Seminary, Tokyo, Japan.
(770) '24 Charles D. Matthews, Birmingham Southern College, Birmingham, Ala.
(617) '21 Prof. I. G. Matthews, Crozer Theol. Sem., Chester, Pa.
(846) '26 Prof. Joseph B. Matthews, S. T. M., Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn.
(546) '15 Rev. John A. Maynard, Ph. D., D. D., 7149 Juno St., Forest Hills, L. I., N. Y.
(584) '18 Prof. Théophile J. Meek, Univ. of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada.
(882) '27 John H. Meengs, Th. B., Hartford Theol. Seminary, Hartford, Conn.
(771) '24 Rev. Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph. D., D. D., Grafton, Mass.

(601) '20 Rev. Henry H. Meyer, D. D., Ph. D., 150 Fifth Ave., N. Y. City.
(639) '22 Prof. Russell B. Miller, Ph. D., Ohio Wesleyan Univ., Delaware, Ohio.
(585) '15 Mrs. Ruth Richards Miller, Ph. D., 50 Chetwynd Road, West Somerville, Mass.
(670) '22 Rabbi Louis A. Mischkind, P. O. Box 154, Wilmington, Del.
(475) '11 Prof. Conrad H. Moehlmann, 51 Mulberry St., Rochester, N. Y.
(921) '28 Prof. James Moffatt, D. D., Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., New York City.
(838) '26 Rev. G. Gardner Monks, B. D., 46 Massachusetts Av., Worcester, Mass.
(236) '92 Prof. J. A. Montgomery, Ph. D., 6806 Greene St., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.
(912) '28 Lewis C. Moon, 3107 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.
(566) '16 Pres. Julian Morgenstern, Ph. D., 3988 Parker Place, Cincinnati, Ohio.
(698) '22 Prof. Elmer W. K. Mould, 503 Fitch St., Elmira, N. Y.
(331) '99 Pres. Warren J. Moulton, Ph. D., Bangor Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.
(772) '24 Prof. James Muilenberg, Mt. Holyoke College, S. Hadley, Mass.
(868) '27 W. H. Murray, 60 Fifth Ave., New York City.
(627) '21 Prof. Thomas Kinloch Nelson, M. A., D. D., Theol. Sem., Alexandria, Va.
(508) '13 Rev. Wm. M. Nesbit, Watertown, Conn.
(924) '28 Mrs. Robert W. New, 68 Carleton Road, Belmont, Mass.
(806) '25 Prof. Herbert L. Newman, B. D., 2 West Court, Waterville, Maine.
(608) '20 Rabbi Louis I. Newman, 125 Jordan Ave., San Francisco, Cal.
(839) '26 Prof. Edward E. Nourse, D. D., Hartford Theol. Seminary, Hartford, Conn.
(820) '24 Prof. Julian Obermann, 9 W. 97th St., N. Y. City.
(732) '22 Rev. Henry Offerman, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
(476) '11 Miss Ellen S. Ogden, Ph. D., Resthaven, R. F. D., Milford, Mass.
(859) '26 Miss Evelyn Oliver, Wheaton College, Norton, Mass.
(572) '16 Prof. Albert T. Olmstead, Ph.D., 706 S. Goodwin St., Urbana, Ill.
(857) '26 E. A. Overton, A. M., 1815 Morningside Ave., Sioux City, Iowa.
(773) '24 Prof. Ernest W. Parsons, 278 Alexander St., Rochester, N. Y.
(757) '23 Mrs. Katherine S. H. Paton, S. T. B., 50 Forest St., Hartford, Conn.
(240) '92 Prof. L. B. Paton, Ph. D., 50 Forest St., Hartford, Conn.

LIBRARY OF
Conebrake Theological Seminary

George Dale
Yale.

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

VOLUME XLVIII 1929

PARTS I AND II

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM: A SYMPOSIUM

A) THE PROBLEM OF THINGS NEW AND OLD IN THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY . . . . F. C. PORTER 1
B) THE INFLUENCE OF SECOND ISAIAH IN THE GOSPELS AND ACTS . . . . . C. C. TORREY 24
C) THE INFLUENCE OF SECOND ISAIAH ON THE EPISTLES. . . . . J. H. ROPES 37
D) NEW AND OLD IN JESUS' RELATION TO JOHN B. W. BACON 40
E) THE PLACE OF JESUS IN THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF HIS DAY . . . . . S. S. COHON 82
F) THE ORIGINALITY OF JESUS' ETHICAL TEACHING . . . . . E. F. SCOTT 109

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

Drawer 8, Yale Station,
New Haven, Conn.

$ 5.00 a Year Double Numbers, $ 2.50

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

PUBLICATION COMMITTEE FOR 1929

GEORGE DAHL, Yale University.
B. W. BACON, Yale University.
FRANK C. PORTER, Yale University.

Communications for the Editors should be addressed to Prof. GEORGE DAHL, 2102 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.

Articles appearing in the Journal are regularly listed in the International Index to Periodicals.

Members two years in arrears in the payment of dues will be dropped from membership in the Society.

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY FOR 1928

President	J. E. FRAME, Union Theological Seminary.
Vice-President	W. F. BADÉ, Pacific School of Religion
Recording Secretary	HENRY J. CADBURY, Bryn Mawr College.
Corresponding Secretary	GEORGE DAHL, Yale University.
Treasurer	MILLAR BURROWS, Brown University.
Associates in Council	H. C. ALLEMAN, Syracuse University. MOSES BAILEY, Wellesley College. E. OLIVE DUTCHER, Wellesley College. H. S. GEHMAN, Philadelphia. SOLOMON ZEITLIN, Dropsie College.
Representative among the Trustees of the American Schools of Oriental Research	WARREN J. MOULTON, Bangor Theological Seminary.

Printed by Offizin Haag-Drugulin A.-G., Leipzig (Germany), for the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Bacon, B. W., New and Old in Jesus' Relation to John 40
Barton, G. A., The Habiri of the El-Amarna Tablets and the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine 144
— The Question of "Ur-Marcus" once more 239
Batten, L. W., Hosea's Message and Marriage 257
Bratton, F. G., Continuity and Divergence in the Jesus-Paul Problem 149
Burrows, M., Mark's Transitions and the Translation Hypothesis 117
Cadbury, H. J., Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts 412
Cohon, S. S., The Place of Jesus in the Religious Life of his Day 82
Dahl, G., Some Recent Interpretations of Second Isaiah 362
Dalman, G., Einige geschichtliche Stätten im Norden Jerusalems . 354
Dobschütz, E. von, Die fünf Sinne im Neuen Testament 378
Fullerton, K., The Strophe in Hebrew Poetry and Psalm 29 . . 274
Gehman, H. S., The Hesychian Influence in the Versions of Daniel 329
Goodenough, E. R., Kingship in Early Israel 169
König, Ed., Die sprachliche Gestalt des Pentateuch in ihrer Beziehung zur ägyptischen Sprache 333
Kraeling, E. G., The Interpretation of the Name Noah in Gen. 5 29 138
McCasland, S. V., The Scripture Basis of "On the Third Day" . 124
Meek, Th. J., Some Emendations in the Old Testament 162
Moffatt, J., The Interpretation of Romans 6 17—18 233
Obermann, J., Yahweh's Victory over the Babylonian Pantheon . 307
Perry, A. M., An Evangelist's Tabellae: Some Sections of Oral Tradition in Luke 206
Porter, F. C., The Problem of Things New and Old in the Beginnings of Christianity 1
Riddle, D. W., The Rockefeller-McCormick Manuscript 248
Ropes, J. H., The Influence of Second Isaiah on the Epistles . . 37
Scott, E. F., The Originality of Jesus' Ethical Teaching 109
Torrey, C. C., The Influence of Second Isaiah in the Gospels and Acts 24
Welch, A. C., The Problem of Deuteronomy 291
Books Received 426

Proceedings, December 27th and 28th, 1928 i
Members of the Society ix
Libraries and Institutions xxiii
List of Exchanges xxvi
Constitution and By-Laws xxviii

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY AND JUDAISM: A SYMPOSIUM

A

THE PROBLEM OF THINGS NEW AND OLD IN THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY

FRANK C. PORTER
YALE UNIVERSITY

THE subject of this Symposium was chosen because of the recent appearance of important books which bear upon it. The completion of Strack-Billerbeck's great *Commentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* puts upon every New Testament student the duty of considering anew the significance of the materials here gathered, especially for the understanding of Jesus and of Paul. Other books, Moore's *Judaism* (1927), Montefiore's *The Synoptic Gospels*, 2d ed. "revised and partly rewritten" (1927), Klausner's *Jesus of Nazareth* (1925), are stimulating and challenging in their various attitudes toward the historical relations between primitive Christianity and the Judaism within which it began and from which it went out. Torrey's *Second Isaiah* (1928) opens afresh the question of the significance of that writing for the messianic hope of later Judaism and for Christian beginnings. Of the many important special topics involved some will be dealt with in detail in the following articles. It is the purpose of this introductory paper to consider briefly the nature of the problem of old and new in historical studies, and especially at the significant moment in the history of religion marked by the rise of Christianity, and then to suggest some of the principal different lines of approach to the

problem, or different points of view from which Judaism and Christianity have to be regarded and compared.

The historian of religion must reckon himself among the scribes discipled to the kingdom of Heaven in that he brings out of his treasure things new and old. But the distinction between new and old is never to him clear and final. The new in the history of ideas is never wholly new, nor the old wholly old. Religious institutions and customs, rites and festivals, creeds also and dogmas, are always old however far we can follow them back toward their beginnings. But human life is always new; age differs from age, and person from person; so that the thoughts and feelings with which old religious rites are performed and old religious formulas repeated are constantly changing. Nothing can be wholly new in the sense that it is out of relation to its background and environment, yet nothing wholly old if it has to do with living human beings. The background is never sufficient to explain human persons and happenings, though some historians write as if it were.

Rabbinical Judaism which took definite form after, and certainly in a measure because of, the Jewish-Roman War and the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A. D., and the failure of the new revolt against Rome in 132—5 A. D., can be called new as well as old; and Christianity, which began as a movement within Judaism, and after its separation was completed still kept the Jewish Scriptures as its own, can be called old as well as new. Rabbinical Judaism preferred to call itself old because it remained Jewish and claimed that tradition belonged to it, though the very conception of tradition opened the way to progress and change. Christianity called itself new because it separated from that which called itself old; yet it also claimed to be old in the truest sense. In a way no doubt Judaism in the first and second century of our era resolved not to be new, not to adjust itself to the culture of the world; and it did its best to shut out the foreign influences that threatened the loss or the harming of its inheritance; while Christianity determined to be new, free enough from tradition and custom to attract and satisfy men and women of different races and inheritances. But the oldness of Judaism, although

Dr. Moore says that with the Bible in its hands it could do nothing else than what it did, does not mean that new events and conditions and new leaders left it unchanged. Nor does the newness of Christianity mean, as Marcion thought that Paul meant, that a new God had come into the world in Jesus, bringing redemption from the evils which the God who created the world and gave the Law could not overcome.

Historians always and everywhere have to reckon with things new and with things old. Just now they are no doubt especially attracted to the task of discovering the old everywhere, and incline to think that things that seem to be new are to be explained by discovering sources and relationships which prove them to be old. It sometimes seems as if the historian's first and last wisdom was expressed by the words of the Preacher, "That which hath been is that which shall be; . . . and there is no new thing under the sun. Is there a thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been long ago, in the ages which were before us." This, I am convinced, is the wrong way of attempting to give to history the character of a science. Natural science attempts to understand things and happenings in the region of the material, where it is true that whatever appears to be new and strange is a challenge to the mind to remove that appearance of newness by finding the relation of the seeming stranger to what has been before, to the facts and forces with which we are familiar. When the new has been proved old we are satisfied that we understand it. But the analogy of the physical sciences does not apply to human history, to persons and their characters and doings, or applies only in a much modified sense. Every person differs from every other, even though we can understand others only because of that which is common to them and to us. In spite of this common nature, what distinguishes men is more important than what unites them. We know a person best when we know him most personally as a distinct individual, and see in him not only the common humanity which indeed he must have, nor only the man of his own race and place and time, though that also he cannot but be; we know a person of the past best when we know

him as we know a friend in the present, that is, when we know what is newest in him and most distinguishes him from all others. In the case of a living friend, since we share his time and place, his inheritance and surroundings, we do not need to help our understanding of him by transferring ourselves into another world, remote and strange. This we do have to attempt in the case of men of the past; but it seems to me that it is of primary and now of pressing importance to realize that this study of the man's past and discovery of what was old in him is only a means to an end, only a way of approach to the man himself. It is the man that we want to understand; and after making ourselves at home in his place and age we still have our chief task before us, to know him in his distinctive character, different not only from us because he belonged to a different race and age, but different from everyone else in his own time, his difference being the significant thing about him. It is this difference between persons and things which makes the question of old and new mean one thing to the scientist and another to the historian.

The newness of a man whether past or present is measured by his greatness. There are men of whom we may say that they are nothing but men of their time and place, and have only a representative significance. But the greater the man the less do his time and place explain him. Now in the special historical problem before us, the relation between primitive Christianity and Judaism, we are dealing to be sure with broad and complex movements, but also with great, individual, creative men. The understanding of the beginnings of Christianity means the understanding of Old Testament history, and especially of events and conditions in the three or four centuries in the midst of which it arose. But above everything else it means the understanding of two persons, Jesus and Paul; and just in the case of these two men the problem of new and old is of peculiar difficulty and importance. The old in them is unmistakable, but the new is extraordinarily great and significant.

It is often claimed, and sometimes almost as if it were beyond the need of proof, that all that Jesus said is to be found in the

sayings of the rabbis. If the thousand pages of Strack-Billerbeck's commentary on Matthew consisted of parallels, then indeed it would seem as if the search for anything new in the words of Jesus would be useless. But this, of course, is far from being the case. Indeed I think that one who is looking for parallels to the greater sayings of the Gospels will meet many surprises and disappointments. Most of the material here collected consists of illustrations of rabbinical usage of words and phrases, indispensable to the interpreter, yet leaving the question of newness very much as it was. For the newness of a great teacher, prophet, or poet, whose words have been creative through the ages and are still living and powerful, is to be discerned only by one who feels the distinction and greatness of the personality behind them. How personality gets itself incarnated in words remains a wonder, however many wise and true things have been thought and said about it. The question is not so much whether what is said has never been said before, but rather how it is said by our teacher in such a way as to impart his own vision of the beauty which he sees, and the power to see for ourselves what he sees, and to feel about it as he feels. The way things are said, the things that are not said, the selection and emphasis, the passion which prompts and shapes the utterance,—these characterize the words of the great teacher. Shall we say simply that the newness of the words of a religious prophet depends upon the immediateness, the first hand quality of his religious experience? One who tells what he himself sees and feels has the essence of newness in him. The question of new or old cannot be answered by finding parallels, or not finding them. Newness is inevitably felt in the words of one in whose experience "old things have passed away, behold they have become new."

Now having spoken in defense of the newness of personality and its rights over against the exclusive claims of the old which conditions every human life, I want to turn, nevertheless, toward the old in order to remind you of the variety of the events and movements in Jewish history in the age in which Christianity began, and so of the variety of aspects in which the relations

between the two religions must be viewed. Familiar as the facts are there is, I think, a need of insisting upon this variety because of the tendency on the part of some influential writers so to emphasize the rabbinical literature as to make it seem the main source of the only sort of Judaism which we need to reckon with as the background of the New Testament.

I. Let us look first at the political situation of the Jewish people in this period. Foreign rulers Judaism had known from the exile on. But the effort of Antiochus IV to put an end to the Jewish religion by force was something new and of great consequence in Jewish history. The first response of the religious minded found its expression in the Book of Daniel, a book of a new type which the new crisis called forth, an apocalypse, a book of the Chasidim, which held up the ideal of fidelity to their religion even to death, with the promise of a speedy intervention by God, the death of Antiochus, the fall of the Seleucid empire, the establishment of Israel on the throne of the kingdom of its God, and the rising of the martyred dead to have part in the glory of that kingdom. From the time of Antiochus until the last of the Roman wars, that is for three centuries, apocalypses continued to appear, expressing, in a form that was certainly popular and influential, one way in which the Jewish national spirit and religious faith maintained itself against the influence, sometimes violent, sometimes insidious, of the powerful Greco-Roman heathenism. It is not fair to make little of the significance of this literature by saying that it was popular and not scholastic and that it was finally set aside by normative Judaism. The lifetime of Jesus and of Paul falls within the period when this literature was prevalent, and when the conflict and self-assertion against foreign rule and culture was the most distinguishing mark of the Jewish religion.

It was the matter also over which parties divided. For the Book of Daniel was not the only reaction of Judaism against Antiochus. By its side came at once the very different national self-assertion of Mattathias and his sons, who did not wait for God's intervention, but believed that he would be on their side

as they led the people to arms. Even though to the writer of Daniel this seemed only "a little help", yet the faith which inspired the apocalypse to hope for the immediate coming of God inspired also Judas and his brothers as they fought for the recovery of the temple, and then went on to fight for national independence, and assumed first the office of high priest and then also the title of king. The Chasidim withdrew their support when the war became, to their way of thinking, no longer a religious war; and the Pharisees came into being as the party of protest in the name of religion against using worldly means, and gradually substituting worldly for religious ends; while the Sadducees arose as the opposing party of supporters of the Hasmoneans. The century of the revolution and the kingdom of the Hasmoneans could not but revive the national spirit and hope, and when Rome brought this Jewish priestly kingdom to an end the new national spirit did not die. The Jews could not accept it as fit or right that the people of the one God should be subject to the godless world power of Rome. The Pharisees, if we may learn their early attitude from the Psalms of Solomon, after having helped to bring about the end of the offensive Jewish kingdom and the acceptance in its place of subjection to Rome, yet looked forward to a kingdom of God which a king of David's line would bring about, a king in all respects the opposite of the worldly Levitic kings whose power Pompey had ended, a righteous and holy ruler who would create a righteous and holy nation, yet one who would also subdue the heathen and expel them from Israel's land. The apocalyptic literature tended to make the fall of Rome an immediate act of God, or the work of a heavenly Messiah such as the Parables of Enoch and the Apocalypse of Ezra described as the Son of Man of Daniel's vision. The Pharisees seem not to have favored revolution, though if they were persuaded that a would-be leader of revolt against Rome would prove to be the Messiah they could not have withheld their support. The position of the great rabbi, Gamaliel I, toward leaders of revolt, as reported in Acts 5 $^{34-39}$ may well have been that of the majority of the Pharisees. The true leader of revolt, the Messiah, will be known in the end by

his success. The *Assumption of Moses* may not be Pharisaic, yet it seems to reflect the feeling of the most religious Jews at the time of Jesus' birth. Their duty was fidelity to their religion unto death. God himself would come as king in his own time and elevate Israel above Rome as master of the world. The prayer, *Shemone Esre*, is proof that such hopes were cherished by the early rabbis. But above all, and whatever differing opinions may be held as to the currency and popularity of the apocalypses, the events of 66—70 and 132—5 A. D. constitute convincing proof that the actual fall of Rome and the actual reign of Israel belonged to the faith and hope of normative Judaism in the time of Christ.

Josephus should not be neglected for the sake of doing justice to the later writings of the rabbis. He attributes the Jewish war against Rome directly to the movement which he calls the Fourth Philosophy, and says that it was started by Judas the Galilean, with the help of the Pharisee, Zadok. He conceals or disguises for obvious reasons the messianic hopes which inspired such revolutionary leaders and their followers. But as if inadvertently, in Book VI, when summarizing the causes of the war with its tragic consequences, he puts the hope of Messiah above all others. "But what most of all incited them to the war was an ambiguous oracle, likewise found in their sacred scriptures, to the effect that at that time one from their own country should rule the world. This some took to mean some one of their own race, and many of the wise were led astray in their judgment. But in fact the oracle signified the sovereignty of Vespasian, who was proclaimed emperor on Jewish soil." Whatever genuine Jewish hopes Josephus may have secretly cherished he affirms in his history that Rome is the kingdom to which God wills that the world should now belong, and that Vespasian is the ruler who is to receive the kingdom of the world from Palestine in fulfilment of messianic prophecy.

The political situation and the nationalist feelings and ambitions which Josephus and the apocalypses enable us to understand have certainly to be taken into account when we try to interpret

the beginnings of Christianity in its relation to Judaism. Messiah was the first interpretation of the significance of Jesus by his disciples, and the Jewish messianic hope gave its name to the Christian religion. In some way Jesus' use of the phrase Kingdom of God must have expressed his attitude toward the political or national side of the faith and hope of his nation. In it old and new are both present and the separation of new from old is possible only if the old is well understood. Yet even here it will not do to assume that when we understand the current Jewish conceptions we know what Jesus himself must have meant. He must, we feel sure, have expressed definite views about the religious meaning for his people of their political condition and their national ambitions and expectations. But what he thought of his own calling and of God's purpose for Israel must be found out, not by giving him a definite place among the parties that divided Judaism in his time, but by entering as deeply as we may into the secret of his own personality.

In regard to the relation of Jesus to the current Jewish conceptions of the Kingdom of God and the Messiah and to the apocalyptic literature, it seems peculiarly tempting to assume that to recognize the old is to be historical, and to discover anything new is to be prejudiced, misled by our wishes to a substitution of modern for ancient conceptions. Jesus was a boy in Galilee when Judas the Galilean led the first of many revolts against Rome, and started the revolutionary party to which Josephus attributes the fall of the nation. Jesus was evidently not a leader of revolt, and seems not even to have foretold the fall of Rome, though like the Baptist, who also led no revolt, and threatened his own people, not the hated foreign powers, with the judgment of God, Jesus may have died because the Roman procurator in his case, as the Herod in John's, feared that his power over the people might incite them to insurrection.

But what was Jesus' own conception of the Reign of God, the past and present invisible, and the future, visible Reign, to use Schechter's terms; and what did he desire and expect as his own and as his people's part in its coming? He need not have shared

the hopes of any of the various factions which divided his countrymen. Neither John nor Jesus were prophets of the apocalyptic type. This has to be emphasized even when one is urging the importance of the apocalypses for the understanding of Judaism and of Christian beginnings. John was a prophet of the old, not of the new order. That is evident in the thing that was most evident about him, that he was a prophetic speaker, not writer, a great personality, not one who concealed his identity by assuming a great name out of the past. It is evident also in the fact that his message is not the fall of Rome, but the judgment of God against his own people. Great prophetic personalities, Jesus and Paul, originate and shape the new religion. The apocalyptic spirit and apocalyptic materials are not characteristic of the New Testament, though they are to be found in it. Apart from the Book of Revelation, the New Testament is not a book that is chiefly concerned with revealing the mysteries of the heavenly world and of the future. It is not, apart from Revelation, a book of visions. The personal presence of a living prophet always means a different content of prophecy as well as a different form.

Besides the conditions and movements of his time we have always to consider Jesus himself, his own experience of God, his own understanding of God's purpose for Israel and for human beings as he daily met and knew them, his own conception of what constituted greatness and rulership in God and in man. We shall not solve even this problem of Jesus' teaching of the Kingdom of God, which so self-evidently requires Josephus and the apocalypses and the materials which Strack-Billerbeck have gathered for its historical study, by any merely external use of them. Not even at this point, so evidently a matter of contemporary language and thought, can the collections by themselves answer the main question.

II. But by the side of the problem of Roman rule which divided Palestinian Judaism into parties and culminated in the disastrous wars, there is, in the second place, the problem of the relation of Judaism to Hellenic culture, which faced especially the Greek speaking Jews of the dispersion. As with reference to the Roman

empire so also in regard to Hellenic literature, thought and life, Judaism took one course and Christianity another; and it is necessary to trace this difference also backward and see if its beginning or its reason is to be found in the original nature of the Christian movement in Jesus or in Paul. Christianity did not join in the Jewish wars of rebellion against Rome nor share its hopes of gaining world rulership through force. Still more evidently did Christianity make a different choice in its attitude toward Hellenism. The final literature of Judaism, the rabbinic, resulted from and expressed not only the Jew's determination to maintain their separate entity in spite of the rule of Rome and under whatever government and laws they might find themselves living, but also their determination to exclude the culture of the world, the philosophy and literature and art as well as the religions of Greece and Rome. To remain Jews, true to their Semitic heritage, untouched and unharmed by the world, we should say also unenriched by the world, is the ideal which the Talmudic literature embodies. But as in the former case of political power so here Judaism decided to renounce the world only after it had tried to make itself at home and master in it. The rabbis, Jochanan ben Zakkai and his successors, prepared the way for a Judaism which withdrew both from political activity and from the effort to absorb Greek thought, to adjust itself to Greek tastes and wants and to win Greek converts. But it is as necessary to make oneself familiar with this second effort of Judaism as with the first in order to understand the beginnings of Christianity in their relations to Judaism. Besides the Palestinian Judaism and its revolutionary movements against Rome which Josephus enables us to understand we must enter also into the minds of the Jews who were making efforts that were for a time astonishingly successful to draw the Greco-Roman world to the Jewish faith.

The Greek Old Testament is surely the most significant translation in the history of our western civilization. It came into being, no doubt, to meet the needs of Greek speaking Jews; but it served as the principal instrument in the effort to win gentiles to the Jewish faith. In the effort to interpret the religion of the

Old Testament to the mind of Greeks, to give Judaism a Greek character and fit it to become the religion of the Roman Empire, the greatest significance must be attributed to the work of Philo. It is not necessary to suppose that Philo wrote chiefly for heathen readers. The task of uniting the Jewish religion with Greek psychology and ethics and with Greek religion was a necessity for the Jews themselves as well as for opening to the Greeks the way towards making Israel's faith their own. Philo may be said to have become a Greek to the Greeks that he might gain the Greeks as well as hold Greek Jews to their religion. He certainly believed that he was truly interpreting Moses when he made him the teacher of Platonism and Stoicism. His purpose was to Judaize the Hellenistic world; but when official Judaism rejected him and all that he stood for it seems to have been because they judged that such efforts as his involved instead a Hellenizing of Judaism.

If it is necessary to approach the gospels and the historical Jesus in view of the national messianic hopes and revolutionary spirit of the Jews in Palestine, it is necessary to approach the Christianity of Paul in the light of the Greek form that Judaism was taking in the dispersion and in the minds of the Greek proselytes whom the synagogues were attracting. That Paul is an important factor in the beginnings of the Hellenization of Christianity can hardly be questioned, though he did not begin the process and is not responsible for all that issued from it. Some sort of adjustment of the originally Hebrew type of Christianity to the Greek world was involved in Paul's calling as the apostle to the gentiles. Paul seems purposely to avoid saying that he became a Greek to the Greeks that he might gain the Greeks, though he all but says it, and it does, with certain reservations, describe his work. Paul had no intention of transforming Christianity into a Greek mystery cult, but his teaching of the inner oneness of the Christian with Christ was certainly fitted to support the claim that Christianity could fill the religious needs that the pagan mysteries professed to meet; and Paul sometimes puts this experience in language that seems meant to imply that claim.

It is certainly illuminating to compare and contrast Paul and Philo. They were alike in wanting to put a Semitic religion into the Greek language and to interpret it so that it would be understood and welcomed by the Greek mind. Philo allegorized the Torah so that its deeper meaning became a Platonic and Stoic conception of the soul, its attainment of virtue, and its ascent toward God. But he held, nevertheless, that the laws should be observed in their literal sense especially in order to create a community and prevent the isolation of the individual. Paul in a much more Hebraic manner of thought but with a more radical, anti-Jewish outcome, explained the place which the Torah had in the purpose of God in history, and argued that its function had been now fulfilled and that it no longer required to be obeyed. God had provided in Christ a different way for the attainment of righteousness, and a different unifying object, a community-forming influence. Both believed in the destination of the Old Testament religion to universality, and labored toward that end, Philo by finding universal human meanings in the Old Testament, Paul by announcing a new stage in God's accomplishment of his purpose, one which involved the end of the old distinction between Jew and Greek. In their use of the Old Testament, in spite of the occasional allegorizing of Paul, their methods are fundamentally different. Each is in his way a mystic, but the kind and degree of their mysticisms fall radically apart. The Stoic conception of the Logos, so important in Philo, appears, though very slightly, in the Christology of Paul; but here also the difference is greater than the likeness. Both believe in life after death but in the nature of that life, in the grounds of their certainty of it, and in the ways in which it is to be attained, there are very significant differences between them. The comparison is important not because of the possibility that Paul may have read something in Philo's writings, but because these two are the chief representatives of two great efforts to bring Hebrew religion and Hellenic culture together. Hellenistic Judaism prepared the way for Christianity's conveyance of a religion built on Hebrew presuppositions to the Greco-Roman world. A great work of

Jewish propaganda preceded that of the first Christian missionaries, who were Hellenistic Jews, and the first heathen converts, most of whom would have been already attached to the synagogue.

In view of the urgency with which some are pressing the almost exclusive claims of the rabbinical literature, it is important to put special emphasis on the significance of these two great efforts of Judaism; the effort in Palestine to regain national independence by shaking off the yoke of Rome; and the effort of Greek speaking Jews in the dispersion to adjust their traditional religion to their new language and ways of thinking and living, and to draw heathen to their synagogues and into a partial or complete acceptance of their religion. It was not even after one tragic failure of the first of these efforts, not only after 70 A. D. and under Jochanan ben Zakkai, but finally only after 135 A. D. that the hope to gain independence by revolution was given up and the ideal of protecting their own treasure until the coming of the Day of the Lord took its place. During the same general period, that of Christianity's beginnings, by a process which we have not the necessary evidence to retrace, the second effort came to an end, missionary propaganda in the Roman Empire was dropped. Christianity here followed Hellenistic Judaism, gaining a larger success because of the large success of the Greek Jews before them. It valued and preserved the Greek Old Testament and the works of Philo and Josephus. Christianity's inheritance and preservation of this literature and Judaism's complete repudiation of it constitute impressive proof of the great difference of tendency and inner spirit between the two religions. For our present problem we are led to ask where the difference begins, through whom and by what steps it became so exceedingly important in its results. The political movements which Josephus records, to which the apocalypses gave one widely influential sort of interpretation and stimulus, form the most direct approach to Jesus himself and his own attitude toward messiahship and toward Israel's place in the kingdom of God; while the interaction between Hebrew religion and Greek religion, philosophy, and ethics, makes certainly one broad way of approach toward

the mind and task of Paul. The rabbis, Jochanan ben Zakkai and his successors, prepared the way for a Judaism which withdrew both from political ambition and from the effort to appropriate Greek thought and to adjust itself to Greek needs. These withdrawals on the part of what then became official Judaism brought with them a more or less conscious and purposed obliteration of the earlier Jewish movements which had a different aim and issue. The Roman War of 66—70 A. D. is not accounted for by the picture of the Judaism that preceded it and resulted in it which we derive from the Rabbinical literature. The accounting is the other way. The Roman War explains the concentration of Judaism in Pharisaic and rabbinic lines. Again even more surprising, from the Talmudic point of view, is the new war of 132—5 A. D., and the support of Bar Cocheba by leading rabbis of that time. If Josephus had his reasons for obscuring the fact and the great importance of the messianic hope in his account of the causes and course of the war, the rabbis had their reasons also for passing by with slight attention the two wars themselves, and giving curious and most unilluminating explanations of the destruction of the Temple. They had their own reasons also for assigning the great movement of Hellenistic Judaism to oblivion. It represented an attitude toward Greeks and toward all things Greek which they had definitely abandoned as impossible for those who would preserve what God had committed to their keeping. We are not to forget that both rejections are later than Christian beginnings. *Fourth Ezra* and the *Apocalypse of Baruch* prove that apocalypses were still at home in Judaism in the beginning of the second century, if indeed more proof were needed than the fact itself of the war under Hadrian. Christian churches valued and preserved the apocalyptic books which the rabbis let go and also the great literature of Hellenistic Judaism. These are two patent and significant facts about the relations between primitive Christianity and Judaism which still need careful study in connection with the thought and work both of Jesus and of Paul. They are facts which cannot be understood and are very likely to be minimized when the rabbinic writings

alone are used as sources for the Judaism of New Testament times. Here for example is Mr. Herford's newest book, which has the title *Judaism in the New Testament Period*, yet in which the two messianic wars, as we may fairly call them, are indeed mentioned, but no explanation is given of the remark that they "had a profound effect upon the Judaism which survived them;" while the great work of Jewish propaganda in the Gentile world does not come into view. But certainly nothing is more important for the historian to understand and estimate than the fact on the one hand that the Christian movement began with a strongly Hellenizing process and ended in a Christian Roman Empire, with the great gains and the undoubtedly great dangers involved in the process and its outcome; while on the other hand Judaism chose the way of exclusiveness, which also had beyond question both great advantages and great dangers of its own. But, especially when we are comparing Judaism and Christianity, it is necessary always to remember that Judaism made these final choices only after it had made desperate efforts to regain national independence by revolutionary wars, and had failed; and only after it had made determined and for a time remarkably successful efforts to draw the Greco-Roman world to the Jewish faith, efforts which it renounced at the same time that Christianity was taking up the same task.

III. We turn now to a third way of approach to our problem of new and old, namely, that of the interpretation of the Old Testament. It is, of course, true that this enters into the two ways of approach already discussed. Old Testament prophecies were the basis upon which the apocalypses, from Daniel on, rested. Unfulfilled prophecies were, we may perhaps agree with Wellhausen in saying, their chief sources and real reason for being. Their primary concern was with the question why the promises of Israel's redemption and glory remained so long unrealized; and the answer they must have looked for in the prophecies themselves. These predictions are the ultimate explanation of the calamitous wars against Rome. It is true also that the putting of the Old Testament into Greek was the primary

condition of the existence and development of Hellenistic Judaism; that Philo held a peculiarly rigorous doctrine of the divineness of every word of Scripture—a Greek rather than a Hebrew doctrine—and that his principal writings were expositions of the Pentateuch. Nevertheless the finally prevailing type of Judaism, the rabbinic type, rested in a more complete and consistent way upon the absoluteness and finality of the divine revelation which Israel possessed in its Scriptures. It was this type of Judaism which "conceived itself as revealed religion, and drew all the consequences of this conception" (Moore). The word "Torah" expressed not only the conviction that the Pentateuch was revelation in the highest sense, but also the elevation of the conception of revelation in all Scriptures and in Tradition as Israel's supreme glory. The religion of the rabbis was Torah-religion. They devoted themselves to the study of the Book and of the Tradition which preserved its true meaning, as an end in itself, as their chief religious duty and joy.

Philo's two chief works may be put in a certain parallelism with the two chief sorts of writing which the work of the rabbis produced, one being commentaries on books of the Pentateuch, and the other a systematic arrangement, an exposition and elaboration, of the Mosaic laws. Both Philo and the rabbis accepted the Pentateuch as having fully and finally the character of revelation, and as containing all that it is God's purpose to reveal of his nature as men are to know it, and of his will as they are to do it. But to Philo the Pentateuch contained chiefly allegories, and it was his main concern to discover the truths which lie beneath the literal sense of its stories and its commands. His great interest, applying this Greek method to the Greek text, was to prove that all that was of value in the philosophy and ethics and religion of the Greeks can be found in the books of Moses and was first revealed through him. But to the rabbis the revelation of God, the Torah, consisted primarily of rules of life. Its actual commands in their literal meaning must be understood and defined, in order that all of life may be subjected in constant and perfect obedience to them. "When the Jews thought

of revealed religion it was religion as a rule of life rather than as the recognition of the one true God" (Moore). "Halakah," meaning "an expansion of 'Thou shalt,' and 'Thou shalt not,' as set forth in the Torah," "is the key to the whole Pharisaic conception of religion" (Herford). This distinction between Philo and the rabbis holds in spite of the facts that Philo urged the literal observance of the laws, as well as attention to their deeper meaning, and that the rabbis added to the Halakah also an haggadic use of Scripture, by which they found all manner of religious and ethical truths, and were able, in spite of their theory of the equal authority of all parts of the Scriptures, to select what was in accordance with "their own worthiest conceptions of God's character and man's duty" (Moore).

The Old Testament meant to the rabbis the peculiar favor of God to Israel shown in the gift of a knowledge of his nature and of his will. As expressed in a familiar and characteristic saying of Akiba: "Beloved are Israel that they are called children of God; greater love that it was made known to them that they are called children of God, as it is said, Ye are the children of the Lord your God (Deut. 14 1). Beloved are Israel that there was given to them the instrument with which the world was created; greater love that it was made known to them that there was given to them the instrument with which the world was created, as it is said, For I give you good doctrine, forsake ye not my Torah (Prov. 4 2)." The satisfaction of Israel in its possession of the Torah is well expressed in Baruch 3 36, 4 1, 3, 4: "He hath found out all the way of knowledge, and hath given it unto Jacob his servant and to Israel that is beloved of him. This is the book of the commandments of God, and the law that is unto eternity: all they that hold it fast are unto life; but such as leave it shall die. Give not thy glory to another, nor the things that are profitable unto thee to a strange nation. O Israel, happy are we; for the things that are pleasing to God are made known unto us." Such sentences should help us realize the powerful appeal of the conception of Torah to the Jewish mind. The Talmud is the classical product of the religion of divine revelation

in Scripture, of "the conviction that everywhere in his revelation God is teaching religion, and that the whole of religion is contained in this revelation" (Moore).

Now Christianity in its beginnings had no sacred Scriptures except the Old Testament. As it passed almost at once from Semitic to Greek speaking peoples, the Septuagint, the Bible of Greek Jews, became the Bible of Christians. The difference between Christianity and Judaism must therefore have been in some sense a difference in the use and understanding of the same sacred Book. The canonical book of Judaism was not only at first the only canon of Christianity also, but it remained a part of its final canonical Scriptures after the New Testament had been added to it; though Marcion warns us that this issue was not inevitable and uncontested.

As in the case of the first and second approaches to our problem, in the attitude toward Roman rule, and in the attitude toward Greek culture, there are actual facts in the outcome which prove that there were radical differences from the beginning between the two religions, so in regard to the attitude toward the Old Testament the outcome proves an initial and deep-going division. We may say that the Mishnah constitutes the interpretation and expansion of the Old Testament which Judaism found necessary and made authoritative; and that this result was involved in making the conception of Torah central in religion, and in treating the Old Testament in accordance with the logic of that conception. Now the New Testament must similarly be taken to be the interpretation of the Old Testament and the supplement to it which the Christian church found necessary, and to which it ascribed authority. And the New Testament is the result of making the person Jesus Christ the center of religion, and of understanding the Old Testament in accordance with him.

In the search for beginnings we were naturally led in the matter of the political situation and the messianic hope to the suggestion that Jesus himself may have brought to a different issue from that which any Jewish party had reached the problem of God's purpose for Israel and the nation's duty and destiny in the world.

While in regard to the relation of Jewish religion to Hellenic culture we as naturally raised the question whether Paul may not have carried forward in a new way the work of adjustment between Hebraic and Hellenic thinking which Jewish thinkers such as Philo, and Jewish missionaries, had undertaken and then relinquished. With the same purpose of defining questions rather than discussing them and coming to conclusions, it is natural in regard to this third aspect of our general problem to ask whether both Jesus and Paul, each in his own very different way, did not agree in quite definitely rejecting the understanding of the Old Testament religion which the word Torah contains, and substituting another for it. Is Herford justified in arguing that the ground of opposition between Jesus and the Pharisees was that "he repudiated the whole system of the Halachah, and criticised, and on occasion rejected, the Torah upon which the Halachah was based," and that he did this "from the point of view of the free conscience and the prophetic spirit?" Paul's antinomianism certainly comes to its most pointed expression when he says that Christ is the end both of the Law and of the distinction between Jew and Greek which the Law defined and made effectual (Rom. 10 4, 12). The difference between the Pharisee and Jesus, between the Halachah and the free conscience is that "the one is worked out in terms of an Idea, viz. Torah, and the other in terms of a Person." "Therein, indeed, lies the deepest root of the fundamental difference between Judaism and Christianity; a difference which nothing can ever obliterate" (Herford).

The New Testament, then, interprets the Old Testament in the light of Christ and according to him. But it is not chiefly concerned with interpreting the Old Testament. It is neither in any considerable part of it a commentary, nor does it attempt a systematic treatment of Old Testament teachings. It claims the support of the Old Testament for the acceptance of Christ as the Messiah of prophecy, and of Christians as the new people of God. But Paul seems to need Old Testament proof only when he is taking a position against Jewish orthodoxy on some matter which depends entirely on Biblical proof, and therefore can be opposed

effectively only on Biblical grounds. With regard to the matters most vital in Paul's Christian experience, whether in thought or in life, he does not feel it necessary that his new beliefs and conduct be according to Scripture, but only that they be according to Christ.

Professor Moore writes, "The interpretation of the Scriptures in the New Testament is of precisely the same kind" as that of the rabbis and that of Philo. It is of course true that the Book of Revelation uses the Old Testament just as Jewish apocalyptic writers do; and that the Book of Hebrews allegorizes quite in Hellenistic style. But the total attitude of Jesus himself toward the Old Testament is radically different from that of his age. In regard to Paul we must fully recognize that he makes use of rabbinical and occasionally of Hellenistic methods of interpretation; but, if I may quote Herford once more, because such prejudice as he has is against Paul and not against the Pharisees, "Paul grasped the fact that the Christian religion was founded on a Person, not an Idea. For him, and for the Church after him and ever since, Christ took and kept the place which in Judaism was held and still is held by the Torah." There is involved in this fact a deep-going difference in his attitude toward the Old Testament from that which he had as a pupil of the Rabbis. Somehow he must read the Old Testament so as to find it culminating in Christ and so as to justify the end of the validity of the Law and of the distinction between Jew and Gentile. It is true that in the New Testament what was new claims to be the fulfilment of the old. Jesus and Paul of course both believed that the Old Testament was on their side in their controversy against current Judaism. The New Testament is dominated by the conception that both revelation and salvation, both the nature and will of God and the freedom and power of man to imitate and to obey him, are given in Jesus Christ. The Johannine writer can represent Jesus as saying, "If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me; for he wrote of me." The feeling with which Christians welcomed Christ as the revelation of God and his will is expressed in Paul's great words: "God who said, Light shall shine out of

darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2 Cor. 4 6).

It is, of course, true that likeness as well as difference will exist when the final authority in both cases is the same Book. As a matter of fact the faiths and the ideals that are common to the two religions are many and of a fundamental character. There is a large common territory between Judaism and Christianity; and it grows larger as historical studies clear away one barrier after another, and progressive and liberal thinking explains, so as in effect to explain away, many things that have held us apart. It is well for us to meet, as we do here in this Society, in the neutral zone, and to take account of the many things in which we agree. It would seem that there is agreement in most of the general truths which make up what we may call the universal contents of our religions. It is in the particulars that we differ; but this is a real difference, and its significance is not expressed by saying that we agree in substance and differ only in form. I must confess to the feeling, which I express here only because I think that it needs the most careful consideration in its bearing on the historical problem which we are studying, that the better understanding of each by the other requires of us something more frank and unreserved, and not only the expression of our common historical interests and even of our common general religious beliefs. We need to hear each from the other what it is in our religion that we most love, what stirs our deepest feelings, what most helps us in our realization of God in worship and in our effort to bring our lives fully into accordance with his will. In our review of Christian beginnings we have come to the point where Torah and Christ appear as the distinctive objects, the particular features by preeminence, of the two religions, which became two because of the alternative choice which these words expressed. Prof. Abrahams wrote, "Those who tell the Jew that he has nothing to love with the passion which a Christian feels for Jesus, forget Israel's passion for the Law." Paul himself tells us better than any one else why to the Christian

flesh and blood seems a more fitting tablet on which a divine message to men of flesh and blood can be written than tables of stone, and why in comparison with the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus the old Law might seem weak because of the sinful nature of man (2 Cor. 3; Rom. 8). We are historians here; but the history of religion must deal with religion itself. Perhaps we shall not go far toward really understanding the course of Jewish history which issued in the work of the rabbis, nor the historical process which resulted in the religion of Paul and of "John," unless we put side by side, in the language of those to whom the experience is their own, the real nature and distinct quality of the two particulars which characterize the two religions, the Torah and Christ; and make it clear in what ways about these two concrete objective centers the great universals of religious faith in God and love and service toward men become effective in character and life.

B

THE INFLUENCE OF SECOND ISAIAH IN THE GOSPELS AND ACTS

CHARLES C. TORREY
YALE UNIVERSITY

THE recognizable influence of Second Isaiah on the Gospels and Acts is in part indirect and intangible. There is an immediate literary relation, seen in formal quotations, and in numerous phrases and images, found here and there, which clearly have their origin in the prophecy; there is also a conception of religion, and of Israel's mission in the wide world, which is more than foreshadowed in the writings of the prophet.

There is an influence, in part literary, mediated by other Jewish writings of the last four centuries B. C. (the few of which we happen to have knowledge), which shaped and elaborated certain ideas which Second Isaiah first brought into clear view. It is not always easy to distinguish the one channel of influence from the other; and the intermediate writings should not be left wholly out of account; but I shall try to confine myself to what is clear.

At the outset this may be said: that the *characteristic ideas* of the Second Isaiah were those which dominated the beginnings of Christianity; whether by this we mean the first written documents of the new Jewish sect, or the ideals expressed and exemplified by its founder and those who stood nearest to him.

We of course have to distinguish between the program which may have been in the minds of the first disciples while Jesus was still with them (a matter of conjecture) and that which they of necessity conceived, or adopted, after his death.

It seems to me very likely, both on grounds of general probability, and also from some literary features, that a portion of the material contained in our three Synoptic Gospels was given written form while Jesus was still alive and in the public eye as a marvellous teacher or prophet. By far the greater part, however, was composed in the shadow of the tragedy which closed his career. What we are given in the four Gospels and the first half of Acts is the earliest interpretation of the Messiahship, obtained from the two chief sources: first, the actual life and death, as reported; and secondly, the scriptures of the Old Testament. Sometimes the one of these two factors predominates, sometimes the other. Always and everywhere, in each and all of these five documents, Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah of the Jews, the one who for centuries had been expected. He is the Scion of David promised in 2 Samuel, the "Servant" depicted in Second Isaiah, and the divine "Man" (in Greek the "Son of Man") foretold by Daniel. And these three conceptions had been combined, speculated upon, and fashioned into a many-sided doctrine, held and cherished by the Jewish people long before the beginning of the Common Era, as the pre-Christian scriptures in their natural interpretation show plainly.

Here stands the protean form of the awaited deliverer and benefactor, the ruler and judge of the world in the coming age; and there, the equally problematic figure of the man of Galilee. The evangelists were interpreters, not biographers; they had no doubt as to the truth, and believed themselves to be its emissaries. The only thing that they could hope to do — the only thing that any one of the five attempted to do—was to equate the man with the picture. "The scripture must be fulfilled;" so not only they, but every one of their faith believed. Hence the narrative of events and the record of discourses are now shaped with reference to the Old Testament predictions, now derived from them. On the other hand, both the interpretation of scripture and the story of the life are colored—the latter constantly—by the supreme fact of the death on the cross. Every essential feature, however, was definitely provided in the scriptures which were universally recognized as authoritative.

The Old Testament prophecy in which the first Christian writers found most clearly the prediction and prototype of the Nazarene was Second Isaiah. Here they found the vision of his work as a teacher, and as a healer of the sick. Here, too, any reader could find in the 53rd chapter the foretelling of his seemingly fruitless labor, his rejection by the people, his death, and his triumphant resurrection. These writers felt the whole prophecy to be Messianic; and the feeling had abundant justification, for the poems of Second Isaiah first gave the national hope both *a definite religious content* and an enduring literary form. They are the fountain head of all the typically Messianic conceptions and portrayals which we find in the pre-Christian literature, canonical or apocryphal. The expected scion of David had been merely a human king; the conception of his rule was now, by Second Isaiah, given a far wider scope, and in addition to this he gave the distinct suggestion of a superhuman being.

He provided a broad and firm basis of Messianic doctrine, but beyond this only the visions of a poet, given with the reserve characteristic of a great artist. He does not theorize himself, but he makes theorizing a necessity for the inquiring and deeply reasoning minds of his people. He takes his stand in the light, but opens the door into the dark. In which of his inspired passages, with all their brilliant personification, can one of us feel sure that he has in mind chiefly the Coming Leader himself, and not a collective unity? We know with certainty that he gave the Messianic idea not only an ethical content but also universal application, and that he was the first to do this; but how clearly, at any point, does he continue to hold before our eyes the picture of an individual? Now and again comes forth the startling, gripping figure of a person; but the picture at once dissolves. He speaks of the Lord's Anointed, the son of David; the one who is to administer justice and rule the peoples of the earth; the man of Yahwè's counsel; and the picture often seems too great for mere human nature, individual or collective.

One might think of preexistence, in reading the first verses of chap. 49: "In the shadow of his hand he concealed me; . . . in his

quiver he hid me away." Here is a being who at least in historic times is kept in concealment from generation to generation, held in reserve for a coming day. But a preexistent Messiah would not at all suit the teaching of the prophet. The outstanding feature of *his* conception, never absent, is that the Anointed One, as an individual, is always the true representative of Israel at its best. Are the people—the best of them—blind and deaf? So is he. Are they discouraged? He cries: "I have labored for nought!" When he gives his life for the salvation of the heathen world, it means that the saints and thinkers of Israel have accepted for themselves the great sacrifice. When the scattered people has learned its lesson, and to a sufficient degree *is spiritually prepared* to adopt and carry out the divine program, then, at last, can be heard the distant cry (66 6 f.) heralding the birth of the "male child."

This is the idea which is given eloquent expression in Mal. 3 1—4, 23 f., where "Messenger of the Covenant" seems to be a designation of the Messiah (the prophecy uttered in a city held by a Persian governor would hardly seek trouble by mention of an anointed king or a prince of David's house). Before the Messiah can come, the way must be in a measure prepared by the Forerunner. Hence in Luke 1 16 f., in the first announcement of the new dispensation, emphasis is laid on the necessity of an Israel turned to God, a λαὸς κατασκευασμένος, "a people *made ready*." Hence also the great importance given in the four Gospels—and especially in the Fourth Gospel—to the work and the witness of John the Baptist; a fact which seems to me to have been misinterpreted in recent years, on the basis of supposed evidence used with lack of due scientific testing.

The Evangelists could not find the Messiah distinctly portrayed in Second Isaiah as a preexistent being; nor, on the other hand, as a king like the kings of the earth. As has already been said, this future protagonist, judge, and ruler is presented by the prophet in purposely blurred outline, seen as through a mist; but there is prepared abundant material for speculation as to his person. "I have put my spirit upon him;" "The spirit of the Lord

is upon me;" and all the world is waiting for his beneficent leadership. When the child is born, when he grows to maturity, he must be more than a mere man among men, he must have *a unique share* of the divine spirit. We can see that the poet will make him a demigod, and the patriot a wondrous king; some will dwell on the purely human qualities, and even on the suggestion of humility and suffering which is so plainly given. The more definite interpretations, the more sharply outlined elaborations, begin at once to appear.

I have already mentioned the striking and very characteristic passage, 66 6 f., with its sudden roar of trumpets in the distant city, announcing the birth of the long-expected Messiah. This is the passage seized upon and splendidly elaborated by a subsequent poet in Is. 9 5 f., beginning: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder!" Here is the "male child," the Coming Leader; and here, at all events, he is more than a man. I quote from Buchanan Gray's *Commentary*, p. 173: "The child . . . is to be a mighty אל, god. This attribution of divinity, implying that the Messiah is to be a kind of demi-god, is without clear analogy in the OT." Divinity is indeed plainly predicated here, and I believe that the Old Testament contains a number of clearly analogous cases; but the fact of present importance is that the glorious picture drawn in chapter 9 was directly inspired by the scene suggested in chapter 66. This we can say with all the more certainty because in the neighboring Messianic announcement in chapter 11, plainly the work of the same writer, we find a passage (vss. 6—9) which beyond all question—when once the question is seriously considered—is a literary elaboration of 65 25. The fact must be emphasized, moreover, that the two passages in chaps. 9 and 11 mark but a slight advance over 66 6 f., when the latter is considered in its context. The birth of the "male child" is expressly contrasted with the birth of Zion's children; it signifies the renovation of the whole inhabited earth, belonging to the time when the lion shall eat straw like the ox, when the glory of Yahwè shall be manifest to all nations and tongues, when new heavens and a new earth are

to be created (vss. 18, 22). Could this be a mere human being? And is there no significance in the *painless* birth, apparently miraculous? It is no wonder that from the time of Second Isaiah onward the human Son of David was replaced by the divine.

Among the numerous Messianic psalms there are two which play an important part in the earliest Christian records. In Ps. 2 7 ff. we read: "The Lord said unto me, *Thou art my son*, this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession;" while by the second verse of the psalm this is made to refer to the Lord's "anointed" (מְשִׁיחוֹ). This obviously is a variation of Is. 55 4 f., where the poet represents Yahwè as making allusion to the promise to David, and then as saying to the Coming King: "Behold, I make thee . . . the leader and commander of the peoples. Thou shalt call nations that thou knowest not; nations that know not thee shall run unto thee." Here, again, is the definite and inevitable recognition of a divine being, a demi-god; and so all the other writers dependent on Second Isaiah seem to have interpreted. Hence the Messianic title, "Son of God," which is prominent in the Gospels and Acts.

The other psalm mentioned above is 110, which begins with the words: "The Lord says unto *my Lord*, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." This is another way of saying precisely the same thing; and since it is an especially clear ascription of divinity—a being standing midway between the nature of the human speaker and the deity of Yahwè—it is often appealed to in the Gospels and 1 Acts. The Messiah is accordingly not only "Son of God," "Son of the Blessed," "Holy One of God" (*ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ*), but also "my Lord," "our Lord" (מָרַאנָא, מָרַאי), a designation which appears a few times in these first Christian documents. Titles multiply, and are taken up into the literary tradition. Those which appear in this portion of the New Testament are all provided in the Old Testament, usually by Second Isaiah. The "Just One," *ὁ δίκαιος*, of Acts 3, 7 and 10 comes especially from Is. 53 11; the "Savior of the World," *ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου*, is taken directly from Is. 49 6, where the Servant is

appointed to bring salvation to the ends of the earth. The heavenly "Man" of Daniel's vision, who takes his place beside the "Ancient of Days", shares in the judgment of the nations, and is given glory and everlasting dominion, is the one who had been described in Second Isaiah as the "man of Yahwè's counsel," whom he had kept "hidden away in his quiver," whose right hand he held, who was destined "to bring forth judgment for the nations."

As for Daniel's vision and its meaning, the vision of a being in human form, coming in the clouds of heaven and entering the very presence of the Most High, it is now usually held that the prophet had in mind not an individual, the Messiah, but a collective entity, since in the interpretation, 7 27, mention is made only of "the saints of the Most High" and their kingdom. But the kingdom of the saints is not a republic; the majesty and glory ascribed in verse 14 to this being could hardly be predicated of mere human creatures, singly or collectively; and the whole representation is precisely that of the openly and expressly Messianic scenes. It seems to me that the commentators have perhaps not taken full account of the peculiar quality of this very cautious apocalypse, which at many points shows a purpose of obscurity such as is unusual even in compositions of this class. It is altogether characteristic that the Messiah should *not* be distinctly named. Moreover, there were good and sufficient reasons, easy to be seen, why a Jewish writer in the lifetime of Antiochus Epiphanes might prefer to make no open announcement either of an anointed son of David or of a warrior "Servant" prepared to trample on Gentile kings. The contemporary readers of the little apocalypse understood perfectly what the prophet was here depicting, as we can see from the Book of Enoch. The designation of the Messiah as "*the* Man" thus came into currency; and would be found especially desirable where caution, mystery, or allusion to Daniel's prophecy were considerations. It is much used in the five Jewish-Christian documents now under discussion, but only in these; the time for its use very soon passed away.

A few of the direct citations of Second Isaiah in the Gospels and Acts are especially instructive, as showing both the paramount

influence of this prophecy and also the attempt to realize a new phase of the Jewish faith. In dealing with the quotations of Hebrew scripture by the New Testament writers we are always on somewhat insecure ground; but here the testimony is so consistent, as to the ideas which were prominent at least in the minds of the evangelists, that we may feel confidence—not as to historical fact, but as to the widely current interpretation.

The fourth chapter of Luke narrates the beginning of Jesus' public ministry. He stands in the synagogue at Nazareth and reads from Is. 61:

> The spirit of the Lord is upon me,
> Because he has anointed me
> To preach good tidings to the poor;
> He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives,
> And recovering of sight to the blind, . . .
> To announce the year of the Lord's favor.

Having finished the reading, he says to the congregation: What the prophet foretold is now realized. This, we are told by some recent commentators, is the announcement of "the gospel to the poor;" a characterization which with singular blindness lays hold of a very minor feature and turns away from what is chiefly significant. On the contrary, the evangelist, or more precisely, the author of the Aramaic document which he is translating into Greek, not only declares Jesus to be the "Servant" of Second Isaiah's prophecy, but also represents him as making this claim for himself at the outset.

Another reported saying of Jesus, common to Matthew and Luke, quotes the same passage in Is. 61 in answer to the query of John the Baptist, "Are you the One predicted by the prophets, or must we wait for another?" (Mt. 11 5; Lk. 7 22). The reply is: "You may see by my works that I am the Anointed One whom the prophet Isaiah foretold."

Aside from the alleged claim of Jesus himself, there are other passages pointing back to the prophet's picture of the Servant of the Lord, and saying in effect that the long-awaited time has come. In the account of the baptism, the voice from heaven, recorded by

the three Synoptists, repeats the words of Is. 42 1, "Mine Elect, in whom I delight;" and the descending dove, mentioned by all four evangelists, appears in fulfilment of the immediately following words, "I put my spirit upon him." This is the passage in which the Second Isaiah first presents his picture of the Messiah, the God of Israel himself introducing him with the word "Behold my Servant!" Hence the choice of this chapter and verse for the most impressive announcements of the Servant in his actual appearance on earth. Thus in the narrative of the transfiguration (Mt. 17 1–8; Mk. 9 2–8; Lk. 9 28–36) the divine voice from the cloud again announces the בָּחִיר, The "Elect One," of Is. 42 1. The added injunction, "Hear ye him," might well refer to Is. 50, where the Elect One begins his discourse by saying: "Yahwè my Lord has given me a tongue for teaching," while in verse 10 Yahwè himself takes the word, saying: "Whoever of you fears the Lord, let him listen to His Servant."

The characteristic reserve of the "Son of Man" depicted in the four Gospels, and his wish to remain as far as possible in retirement, cause Matthew to quote *in extenso* the first four verses of Is. 42, with especial emphasis on the words: "He will not cry out, nor shout aloud, nor make his voice heard in the street; a bruised reed he will not break, a dimly burning wick he will not quench." It is perhaps a little surprising that no one of the other evangelists makes a similar use of the passage, seeing that they also draw this picture of the Nazarene, consistently—and convincingly.

Jesus is actually called "the Servant," with obvious reference to Second Isaiah, in several passages in the first chapters of Acts (3 13, 26; 4 27, 30). In nearly every case the context shows that the *suffering* Servant is especially in mind, and in one passage the purpose of the suffering is set forth. In 3 26 the following words form the conclusion of the address of Peter to the people of Jerusalem: "God, having raised up his Servant, sent him to bless you, *in turning away every one of you from your iniquities.*" This characterization of the Servant's work is mainly the result of reflection on the death of Jesus, but also comes directly from the prophecy. In Is. 53 the Servant turns the Gentiles from sin, and

in chapter 50 he calls his own people to repentance—truly with little effect. In both chapters the *suffering* is dwelt upon, and in 53 a prediction of death may be found (though this was not intended by the poet himself). It is to these passages that the earliest Christian writers appeal again and again, repeating that the scriptures must be fulfilled in the rejection and death of him who (as they were still convinced) was destined to restore Israel.

These passages in Isaiah exercised a tremendous influence on Christian theology from the very first; it is useless to try to imagine what would have resulted if they had not existed. They—and the controversy over them—even left their mark in the Rabbinical literature, in the conception of the other Messiah, not the son of David but the son of Ephraim, who suffered and died. The classical example of primitive Christian interpretation of Is. 53 is of course the narrative in the 8th chapter of Acts, where Philip expounds to the Ethiopian eunuch the passage beginning: "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter."

I said at the outset that *the characteristic ideas* of Second Isaiah dominated the beginnings of Christianity. The quoted passages teach us much, but not all; and there are many more of them than can receive mention in this paper. The poems of the Second Isaiah embody a splendid conception of religion; a conception which became very potent in the last centuries B. C., and stirred the hearts of very many in Israel in the first century of the Common Era; both those who were ready to accept the Christian faith and those who were not. The writers of the Four Gospels and the earliest spokesmen of the new Messianic era reproduced, in their different ways, this old and well defined prophetic teaching; fitting it into the new setting which their time, and especially the person of their Messiah, provided. The prophet called for repentance, and a firm but simple faith; faith in the One God, and in the coming deliverance. He stood for the broadest humanity; the brotherhood of all men, of whatever race or nation, as children of the divine Father. What he saw in imagination was a spiritual revival which, originating with the Jews, and by them given its mighty impetus, should carry with it all the God-seekers in the

world. He had called for foreign missionaries: "Seeing all this, could you not proclaim it?" and again: "Carry it forth to the ends of the earth!" but he was looking for faith, more than for propaganda. He gives his own people a preferred place, und rightly; but proclaims "the word of the Lord, who gathers the scattered of Israel: Yet others to him I will assemble, my own, to be ingathered" (56 8). The author of the Fourth Gospel repeats this, in the words of Jesus (10 16): "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, . . . and they shall become one flock, with one shepherd."

There is nowhere in the four Gospels any thought of moving the center of gravity of the new Messianic faith beyond the boundary of Palestine; there is not even a trace of such thought. They are as loyal to Israel as the Second Isaiah himself; according to their common program, every effort must begin "at Jerusalem." Even the author of the Fourth Gospel insists (and puts the words into the mouth of Jesus) that "*Salvation is of the Jews*," and every portion of his argument implies this.

The religion of Second Isaiah is very conspicuously a religion of *freedom*. He recognizes, with a definiteness which appears nowhere else in like extent in the Old Testament, the true *proportion* in religion. He declares the customary sacrifices unnecessary: "I gave you no command of sacrifice, wearied you not with service of incense" (43 23). Instead of fasting, what God wishes is kindly dealing and a heart free from all malice (58 6 f.). The temple at Jerusalem is a holy place and the pride of Israel, but worship anywhere else is just as acceptable: "What manner of house will ye build for me, and where is the place of my abiding?" (66 1). The prophet saw about him too much of the magnifying of rites and ceremonies, the religion of a sacred book. He would see his people throw aside whatever could hold a man apart either from God or from his neighbor. What he proclaims is relief from distress, the world over; peace on earth and good will among men; and all this under the guidance of the divinely appointed and inspired leader, the Anointed One.

This is also the atmosphere of the Gospels. Jesus is consistently

represented as antagonizing the theory or practice which magnifies what is outward at the expense of what is inward. He held to the Hebrew scriptures, but opposed a book-religion. He saw certain customs and institutions which in their exaggerated observance both starved the soul and prevented the free and helpful intercourse of men and communities, making them absorbed in themselves and in their shell of inherited conventions and narrow in their sympathy. Against these he contended, always loyal to his own people in the same sense in which the prophet, while sharply rebuking, was loyal.

The four evangelists and the author of "1 Acts" (1 1—15 35) held to the ideal of the Messiah and his times as given by Second Isaiah and elaborated by the later writers. The resurrected Jesus was to be the divine head of a purified Israel, the repentant and thereupon irresistible people who should lead the whole world to the truth, after the downfall of kingdoms and the sweeping away of evil-doers; all this exactly according to the program sketched by the prophet. The disciples were to go into all the world and to the ends of the earth, opening the eyes of the Jews first of all, and through them the eyes of the gentiles. Then, when the chosen people should be sufficiently united in faith, and joined by the best of the gentiles, according to the picture drawn in Is. 45, 49, 53, 60 and 66, the great day would come, the Messiah returning in the clouds of heaven, and the Kingdom of God be established on earth.

I have been constantly speaking of these five documents, the four Gospels and 1 Acts, as "the earliest Christian records" and "Jewish-Christian" writings; and this assumption will certainly surprise and perhaps offend (I use the word in the scriptural sense) some of my hearers, including those who know much more about the New Testament than I do. I can only say in self-defence that there is evidence both new and old which is destined, I believe, to bring about a great change in the present ultra-critical view of the writings which profess to represent, and have long been believed to represent, the earliest stage in New Testament literature. I know of many arguments for the late date of the Gospels, but of no argument that will hold water. There is not even the slightest

allusion in any one of the Gospels or the Book of Acts to the destruction of the temple or the devastation by the Romans in the year 70, or significant prediction of that particular catastrophe, though there are very many places where such allusion or prediction would be extremely effective. The supposed references of the kind in the Synoptic Gospels are in every word and without exception merely repeated from the Old Testament prophecies, as can easily be demonstrated in detail. There is no evidence whatever tending to show that any one of the writers whose work appears in these documents had knowledge of this terrible, epoch-making catastrophe, which might well have been held up as a lesson to all the world, used either as propaganda or in a merely homiletic way.

This very impressive argument from silence is supported by positive evidence of quite another character. Each one of the five documents, from beginning to end and in every portion (with the exception of a few verses in Luke), is translated from either Hebrew or Palestinian Aramaic. Sufficient proof of this will eventually be presented; when, or by whom, the coming generation may know; I myself can see what for me leaves no place for even a shadow of doubt.

The "Christian" doctrine in the four Gospels and 1 Acts is all primitive, and tentative. There is not a word in any one of these writings that might not have been written within twenty years after the death of Jesus. This doubtless is because these pioneers had neither the desire nor the occasion to make innovations, rather than because they realized, as some of their successors did not, that while bondage to rites and ceremonies is an evil, bondage to dogma is a greater evil. They took what had been given them, and found it sufficient; the Christology of the Fourth Gospel, for instance, had all been provided long before; only the application was new. It is all in the atmosphere of the Old Testament, and of Palestine under the procurators. The aim is nowhere to cut loose from Judaism, but to give that religion, inherited from the Fathers, a new center and new life; through faith in the risen Messiah, in whose person would be found the fulfilment of the Hebrew prophecies, especially the portrayal of the "Servant" in Second Isaiah.

C

THE INFLUENCE OF SECOND ISAIAH ON THE EPISTLES

JAMES HARDY ROPES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

A few remarks on Paul and 1 Peter may appropriately serve as a footnote to Professor Torrey's paper, although the result of the inquiry is but little short of negative.

First as to Paul. In Paul's epistles Second Isaiah is frequently quoted, and between Paul's thought and that of Second Isaiah profounder resemblances suggest themselves to every student, notably the intense love of each for the Jewish people and sense of that people's divinely given mission, the large vision of the universal character of the true religion (which it was far from Paul to think of as a "new religion"), and the conception of the significance of suffering as vicarious.

But Paul was a Jew, and the essential structural elements of his system reveal his thought as primarily and substantially Jewish. His conception of God is Jewish to the core, and, in his view, it is the character of this Jewish God that has now fully and finally revealed itself in the gift of salvation ("righteousness") through faith in Jesus Christ. So his ideas of duty, of the Holy Spirit (in primary conception at least), of eschatology, of the Messiah. The "mystical" forms of thinking and feeling—the union with Christ and the sharing in his experiences in such a manner that mysticism and ethics become inseparably united—these seem alien to Jewish habits of mind, and we may look for a source in other fields. But,

important and characteristic as these latter forms of thought are, they are after all not so much essential elements of Paul's system as noble and valuable enrichments of it. Without them Paul could have lived his Christian life, as many other Christians have lived theirs. Consequently, any ideas which Second Isaiah and other great writers and thinkers had infused into the Jewish religious world in which Paul grew up were accessible to Paul. To prove direct dependence on the ancient writers requires in this case something more definite than similarity of ideas.

So far as I can see, such a direct dependence of thought is not proved. Paul's quotations from Second Isaiah (chiefly to be found in Romans) do not much relate to matters of substantial agreement in important ideas; they are often hardly more than literary illustrations. They rarely, if ever, provide the telling stroke to close an argument; and Isaian passages which might have served Paul well are passed by.

Only in regard to the universal character and destiny of the true religion does a suspicion arise. On this point of prime interest to the Apostle he has found, and quotes, what he thinks (sometimes wrongly) to be relevant passages from Second Isaiah. Had he been stirred by the latter's noble declarations? and if so, may the influence perhaps have preceded his conversion? His satisfaction in this grand and moving prospect is so intense that the reader may well ask whether it had not been an original hope deep set in his soul to which the mysteries of faith in Christ gave triumphant reenforcement, rather than a new discovery revealed to him in Christ. But this question no one can answer.

One passage, often referred to, deserves a word of comment. In Romans 4 25 Paul writes: "Who was delivered up for our trespasses and was raised for our justification." This relates, of course, to the central significant idea of Paul's system, and it recalls Isaiah 53. The first of Paul's two sentences is like Is. 53 12 in the LXX (in departure from the Hebrew) in the use of παρεδόθη, but not in the word for "trespass." It is conceivable that the cadence of the sentence lingered in Paul's mind and affected his phrase here, but it is equally conceivable that the resemblance in

this very simple language is an accidental coincidence. The words exactly express Paul's thought and he is quite capable of having produced them without even an unconscious influence from Isaiah. In the second of the sentences ("was raised for our justification") the word "justification" recalls Is. 53 11 as rendered in the Vulgate and the English version ("By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many"), but the LXX rendering of the verse bears no relation to Paul's idea, whatever the original Hebrew may have meant. It is difficult to suppose that Paul was influenced by the LXX in the first half and by his own understanding of the Hebrew in the second, and in neither case would the resemblance be sufficient to carry conviction. Although some scholars have rested weighty conclusions on the verse, I cannot feel that they are justified in using this instance to explain the origin of Paul's doctrine of the expiatory character of the death of Christ.

Turning to 1 Peter, we find one case of the elaborate use of Second Isaiah in 1 Pet. 2 22–25, where language of Is. 53 5–12 is skilfully drawn on to depict the conduct of Jesus Christ, so that the writer would appear to have recognized in Isaiah 53 a prophecy of Jesus' sufferings. The verses are associated with the central doctrine, "Christ suffered for you," but are brought in incidentally to an exposition of the duty of slaves to give respectful obedience to cruel masters. The passage sounds as if it were not a piece of original theological thought, but rather the conventional use of a familiar idea; and such it probably was. This is not surprising in an epistle which, in spite of its intrinsic interest and fine passages, nowhere betrays an author of original mind.

In the other epistles of the New Testament quotations from Second Isaiah are occasionally to be met with, but they are not of a nature to suggest any other than a literary influence on the New Testament writers.

D

NEW AND OLD IN JESUS' RELATION TO JOHN

B. W. BACON
YALE UNIVERSITY

JOHN the Baptist is the middle link between Old Testament and New, between Judaism and Christianity. We must expect to find his part proportionately great in that disputed field which lies between and is common to both. Josephus' brief description of his work sees in it nothing beyond a religious purification, a reform movement wholly within the limits of contemporary Judaism. Even the new rite of baptism introduced by John had nothing in it, so Josephus feels, to justify the suspicious temper of Herod Antipas, who first imprisoned the prophet in the border fortress of Machaerus, and there later put him to death because of the extraordinary influence he exerted on the people. Herod's suspicion, therefore, is the only thing in Josephus' report to suggest messianistic features in John's activity. John was "a good man, who exhorted the Jews to exercise virtue." This "virtue" had the two aspects distinguished in contemporary teaching, "justice toward one another, and piety toward God." He recommended baptism as acceptable to God when practiced not as expiatory of "some sins,"[1] but as a symbolic act by which the inner essential purification of the soul through righteous living should be accompanied, and which would

[1] Josephus is distinguishing John's Baptism from some other, but the expression "some sins" (*τινῶν ἁμαρτάδων*) suggests Elkesite rather than Christian practice.

give it that "bodily," external, or ritual purity necessary for acceptable worship. Josephus, at least, sees no objectionable rivalry with the ritual purification prescribed by the Mosaic code, in the rite by which the popular reformer sought to symbolize the moral renewal which alone could (in Luke's phrase) "make ready a people prepared for" the expected Coming of Yahweh's kingdom.

If we limit ourselves to the earliest and most authentic of New Testament references, giving the Baptist's own words, or the words of Jesus about him, we again find nothing to transcend the level of contemporary Jewish piety. The eschatological animus of his exhortation to repentance comes out in stronger colors, it is true, but that only supplies the better an obvious gap in Josephus' story. We understand from the messianistic character of John's preaching in the gospel report why "the suspicious temper of Herod" was roused against the prophet who so stirred the multitude. Luke tells us that John was by birth a priest after the order of Abiah. But, as with Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the call of the prophet and reformer had drowned in his inner consciousness the plea of hereditary appointment. His early life of ascetic seclusion in the wilderness of Judea bespeaks a moral discontent with the ceremonial system to which his youth would have otherwise been dedicated. He becomes not a priest, but a prophet. Only, when we turn to the particular words of his prophetic exhortation we are strongly reminded of that prophet who makes purification of the Levitical priesthood and its service of worship in the temple the supreme condition of the restoration of Yahweh's favor. To the multitudes who come to his baptism we do not of course expect John to address the warnings of that last prophet of the Old Testament canon to whom we give the name of Malachi ("My Messenger"), warnings especially directed to the "priests." Nevertheless in the universalism of Mal. 1 11 and especially the exhortation to repentance in view of the coming judgment of the Angel of the Covenant of Ex. 23 20 f., depicted in Mal. 3 1 f. under the image of a refiner's fire, we cannot but see a parallel, if not the origin, of John's way of preparing for

the coming kingdom. He attempts to institute by repentance and baptism a new people of God, as independent of race as though God should raise up from the wilderness stones a seed of Abraham according to the spirit. It is a new departure, but only as bringing to life again the message of the ancient prophets. It shows a moral revolt against priestcraft and legalism, but there is nothing specifically Christian about it. The new departure of Pharisaism under leadership of the scribes had unfortunately tended toward book religion and legalism. Otherwise the Pharisees themselves need not have held aloof from the preaching of John. Essenes and Zadokites went further than he in their revolt against the Sadducean hierocracy.

But we also hear of sects persistent down to the third century, if not to our own time, to whom the message of John was profoundly new. They applied to him the title of Messiah, which Christians claimed for their Master alone (*Clem. Recogn.* I, 54). They seized with avidity upon his prediction of the Greater One who should follow after. Earlier still was the identification of John with Elias. While Jesus was still engaged in his work of preaching and healing in Galilee, John's martyr fate was brought into relation with current beliefs concerning the men who had been "taken up" to Paradise, to return thence as precursors of the great Day of Yahweh. A generation later we find these beliefs among John's followers taking the form of the doctrine of reincarnation known to the Near East of today as the Imam doctrine. In regions where contact is close with Alexandria it assumes the form of a Logos doctrine, distinguished by the "I am" style. Further inland Syrian syncretism continues the rite of John's baptism, associating with it, after the Samaritan theology, the mystical doctrine of the Hidden (*El-kesi*) and the Revealed. Here is a line of connection with the Baptist and his rite which belongs neither to Church nor to Synagogue, and which yet cannot be disregarded. The problem of old and new is pre-eminently complicated when we attempt to deal with Elxai ("the Hidden One"), contemporary of our fourth evangelist, and with Syrian Gnosticism, which the second century heresiologues

with one voice trace back to Samaria and its group of "disciples of John."

Finally there is Christianity, which in our canonical Gospels and Acts makes John belong essentially to the new order. If he is admitted to stand outside the threshold of the kingdom it is only that he may prepare the way for Jesus, the Greater than he to whom he had looked forward. If Jesus submitted to his baptism it was not that he recognized John's message as having any significance in itself, but only to "fulfill all righteousness," or perhaps to meet the current expectation that the coming Elias, restorer of all things, should crown his mission of bringing Israel to repentance by "anointing the Christ."

As we are all aware, the primitive tradition assumed in Acts 1 22 and 10 37, and reflected subsequently by all four evangelists, makes "the baptism of John" the starting point of the gospel. All four evangelists with growing emphasis insist on annexing him to the Church as a kind of Christian before Christianity, perhaps on the principle of the mens naturaliter christiana. Luke not only assumes, with the rest, that John's initiatory rite was a mere foreshadowing of Christian baptism but explicitly speaks of his message as "preaching the gospel" (Lk. 3 18). On the same principle he refers to certain Johannine baptizers encountered by Paul at Ephesus as "disciples."

All four Gospels mark as a definite turning point in the ministry of Jesus his leaving Galilee to take up the journey which ends at Calvary. Three out of the four make each of the two divisions thus strongly marked coincide in their beginnings with the two crises in the career of the Baptist. Jesus begins his ministry in Galilee "after John was put in prison." He leaves Galilee when he hears of John's martyrdom, and after a brief period of exile "sets his face" to go up to Jerusalem, predicting a fate like John's for himself in the city that "stoneth the prophets."

It is true that Mark does not go so far as Matthew in establishing a causal relation between the imprisonment of John and the beginning of Jesus' preaching. Matthew says explicitly that it was "when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison" that he

took up the cry of the Baptist in identical terms and carried it through Galilee. In Mark the relation is merely chronological. Jesus began his ministry "after" the imprisonment of John. Unlike the stereotyping practice of Matthew, Mark does not use the same phrase to describe the message of Jesus and of John. Mark does not relate any preaching of John's at all save his prediction of the Greater to come after. It is Jesus who for the first time "came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the glad tidings." Mark also tells of the Johannine baptism, distinguishing it from the Christian rite as "the baptism for repentance unto forgiveness of sins." Perhaps if we had his original conclusion we should be told why it was adopted by the Church. If so it could only be because to Mark, as to the rest, John was the real borrower. He anticipated prophetically a rite which properly belongs to Christianity, not vice versa. The slight changes of Matthew from Mark are due to application of the same principle. John is merely advance agent for the gospel.

Even Mark's admission that John's baptism was "unto forgiveness of sins' 'is too great a concession for the later evangelists. Matthew removes the clause to what he regards as the more suitable context of the eucharistic cup (Mt. 26 28). The fourth Gospel goes further. Jn. 1 26–36 expands Mk. 1 4–8 into an explicit denial from the Baptist himself that his baptism has any relation either to repentance or forgiveness of sins. It is solely to make known the Christ. This denial of purifying value to his own baptism John accompanies with a direction of all to Jesus as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." In particular he so directs his own disciples, pointing them to Jesus as the one who not only takes away sin, but "baptizes with the Holy Spirit."

We find thus a progressive attempt to annex the baptist reformation. In the absence of Jesus' own testimony and the words of the Baptist recorded by the Second Source it would be impossible to guess how very large a part of the Christian message was first uttered by him. There is an obvious reluctance of our gospel

sources to allow Jesus to appear in any way dependent upon John, a determination on their part to regard all John's activity as proleptic, a prophet's pointing forward to what should come after. But Jesus' own words and acts suggest that it was not merely after but *because* of John's imprisonment that he took up the cry of the silenced prophet. Analogously it may well have been *because* of John's martyrdom that Jesus first withdrew from Galilee, then, changing the character of his ministry, set his face toward Calvary, challenging a fate like John's even while he predicts for himself a return in the great Day of the Son of Man corresponding to that reappearance of John as Elias of which the rumor was already heard. Again, in spite of our evangelists' representation of baptism as a Christian rite, of which certain elements are conceded to the Baptist by virtue of his function as herald and doorkeeper of the kingdom, it probably was *because* of John's employment of a baptism of repentance as the initiatory rite for membership in the new Israel of God, a brotherhood formed not by birth but by moral new birth, that the first Christians immediately after Calvary began to baptize into the name of Jesus, making this their pledge of faith and loyalty. The experience of the Spirit of Adoption by which their baptism came to be distinguished from the baptism of John was indeed an experience based on the teaching of Jesus, whether we accept or reject the ancient saying twice ascribed to him, "John baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with Holy Spirit." Matthew alone bethinks himself to insert a belated, post-resurrection command of Jesus instituting the rite as if originally Christian. In reality faith in the risen Lord came first, *then* adoption of the Johannine rite, *then* the gifts of the Spirit.

Christian tradition exhibits thus a progressive magnification of everything which could set John forth in the subordinate relation of herald and forerunner of the gospel, with progressive minimizing of all that might allow to his reformatory movement independent value. John is treated like the canonical prophets, whom early apologists assume to have delivered their message not so much for their contemporaries as to "testify beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow." The phenomenon

is too conspicuous, too generally recognized, too easily accounted for by the aims and presuppositions of primitive apologetic, for us to dwell upon it. What I would urge is only the probability that primitive Christianity knew a type of apologetic which for us has passed out of view. I hold our study of primitive sources should take account also of the strong incentive the choosers and framers of gospel story were under to win over "the disciples of John."

The most recent phase of gospel criticism is the so-called "form-geschichtliche Methode." It naturally, and rightly, lays stress upon the influence of controversy with the Synagogue as affecting the development of gospel tradition. But we should do well to remember that champions of the Synagogue were not the only rivals encountered by the earliest propagators of the gospel. Abundant traces still remain in the Christian records, despite all efforts of our canonical writers to minimize their importance, that "the disciples of John" continued to form important groups, and these were by no means all so readily won over to the Church as that described by Luke at Ephesus. Our evangelists do feel it important to demonstrate, as against Jewish unbelief, how the life of Jesus proved him the true Prophet like unto, though greater than Moses, his teaching a fulfilment, even while transcending it, of what "they of old time" had taught. But they can hardly have felt it less important so to shape their account of the relations of Jesus and John as to make it evident to surviving sects of Johannine "baptizers" that real fidelity to the message of the Elijan prophet would require immediate acceptance of the baptism of the Spirit.

Our present enquiry is concerned with this apologetic of the Gospels directed (for the most part tacitly) toward "the disciples of John." If we would do justice to Christianity's mingled elements of old and new this apologetic must be traced back to its earliest manifestations in Synoptic tradition. But in order to make sure that its appearance is no illusion it will be advisable first to devote some consideration to the peculiar phenomena of the fourth, the Hellenistic, or Ephesian Gospel, wherein this anti-baptist polemic is generally admitted to be conspicuously present.

We have already noted how Synoptic tradition in all forms makes John's imprisonment the starting point for Jesus' proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom in Galilee, thus correlating his prophetic activity with that of John. Less conspicuous is the correlation with John's martyrdom of the second phase of gospel story, the via crucis, relating Jesus' self-devotion to the cross in expectation of divine vindication. In Mk. 6 14–9 29 the story of Jesus' conflict with the scribes and withdrawal to heathen territory (which Luke omits for reasons I hope to have made clear elsewhere) forms a digression between two references to the fate of John. Mk. 6 14–29 forms the sequel to the series of faith-wonders in 5 1–6 6. Herod hears of these and is roused to dangerous attention, though Mark, diverted from the thread of his story by his retrospective account of John's martyrdom, omits to tell what followed from this new source of peril. He turns from it to the issue of legalistic particularism and does not revert to the subject until 8 27, where it is suddenly resumed. Jesus is in exile at Caesarea Philippi. As if nothing had intervened he puts the question to his disciples concerning the rumors described in 6 14 f., "Whom do men say that I am? And they answered, John the Baptist: but some say, Elias; and others, One of the prophets." Peter then makes his confession in Jesus as the Christ and Jesus accepts the title, but only in a carefully guarded sense. "He began to teach them that *the Son of Man* must suffer many things and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again." The remainder of the story relates the carrying out of the prediction. Jesus journeys to Jerusalem and challenges the hierocracy by a daring act of prophetic symbolism, which he justifies when the sanhedrin demand his authority by a reference to the divine authority of John.

Mark is careful, as we see, to bring not only the teaching ministry of Jesus in Galilee into direct relation with the work of the Baptist, but also to bring Jesus' career of martyrdom into parallelism with the fate of John. In particular we should note that the mysterious title "Son of Man," which plays so large a

part in all our attempts to define the messianic consciousness of Jesus, but which receives no explanation either in Mark or any other surviving source, is here brought into direct correspondence with the title of "Elias" attached to the Baptist by popular ascription after his death, and apparently in some sense approved by Jesus. The later Synoptists reflect more or less clearly these parallels between Jesus and John in the two phases of their ministry.

The fourth Gospel presents a totally different outline. The story of the fatal journey begins indeed at 7 1, as in Synoptic story, after the Feeding of the Multitude and Jesus' withdrawal from Galilee; but John's martyrdom is not so much as mentioned. As regards the teaching ministry it does not begin in Galilee at all. The Galilean ministry begins at Jn. 4 46 with the healing of the "nobleman's" son. Another ministry, elsewhere completely unknown, is prefixed. This is a concurrent ministry carried on when "John was not yet cast into prison." John and his disciples operate first in "Bethany beyond Jordan," where John dismisses his disciples to the Greater than he. Afterward they baptize in "Aenon near to Salim" in central Samaria, while Jesus and his disciples preach and baptize in Judea. The disciples of John protest at this rivalry but are rebuked by their master, who again explicitly declares the subordinate and transitory purpose of his activity, again commending all his following to Jesus. He disappears from the scene with the farewell utterance: "He must increase, but I must decrease."

This otherwise unknown phase of Jesus' ministry preceding the Galilean is one extraordinary feature of the fourth Gospel, no less marked than the omission from its story of all reference to the Baptist's fate. Other phenomena more directly evincing the aim of correcting an overvaluation of the Baptist and his work are commonly connected with certain evidences from the Book of Acts and patristic references to the development of heresy, showing that sects in Syria and Asia Minor, and perhaps elsewhere, continued for many generations to practice the Johannine rite of baptism without any connection with Christianity, even ascribing

to their martyred prophet the title of "Christ," with attributes similar to those employed by the Church with reference to Jesus. The phenomena of the fourth Gospel are not indeed to be explained without reference to these Lukan and patristic data, but I venture to believe that their true significance has not yet been fully brought to light.

We have already referred to the group of Johannine baptizers at Ephesus, whom Luke adopts as "disciples" but who were more probably what the second century heresiologues call Mazbotheans ("Baptizers") or Hemerobaptists, and who later are designated Sabeans ("Baptizers" from the same root as Mazbotheans) and "Disciples of John." On Luke's premisses Johannine baptizers would necessarily seem to belong to the Church rather than the Synagogue, and, if instructed "more carefully in the Way of God" and receptive of Christian allegiance by a second baptism accompanied by the "gifts of the Spirit," could not be refused full membership in the Christian brotherhood. For my own part, however, I cannot but connect these Ephesian baptists with the group encountered previously at Samaria in a less conciliatory spirit first by Philip, then by Peter and John.

The sect at Ephesus, whose leader appears to be Apollos, the "learned Jew of Alexandria," are not charged by Luke with heretical tendencies, although 1 Cor. 1—4 shows clearly enough that the preaching of Apollos had led later at Corinth to the formation of a faction tending to boast of its superior *gnosis*. Neither does Luke hold these pre-Pauline Christians at Ephesus responsible for the fact that Ephesus became, not long after Paul's death, a fountain-head of Gnostic heresy almost as notorious as Samaria itself. The significant fact is that in both encounters, in Samaria and Ephesus, Luke makes the issue turn upon baptism with or without the "gifts of the Spirit." To Luke baptism without the gifts is at best but half Christian, at worst it is all too prone to seek a substitute in "magic." Yet with all his "witchcraft" Simon the Magian in Acts 8 9—13, 18—24 cannot rival the Christian charismata. Vainly he seeks to obtain them from Peter by the offer of money. He only brings upon himself the doom

from the Apostle of becoming "a gall-root of bitterness and a bond of iniquity," or, in modern terms, the forefather of all false doctrine, heresy and schism. In Acts 19 1–7 the balance is retrieved. The adherents of "the baptism of John" in Ephesus are won over by Paul's disciples and himself, and when rebaptized by him begin to "speak with tongues and prophesy." Peter and Paul, accordingly, one in Samaria the other in Ephesus, enter upon a conflict of thaumaturgy with leaders of semi-Christian and baptizing sects.

This particular Petro-Pauline parallel of Acts seems to have escaped the notice of critics, partly, perhaps, because the Alexandrianism of Apollos has seemed to them more venial than the Gnosticism of Simon Magus, partly because they fail to take account of the unanimous testimony of the heresiologues. For not only do Hegesippus and all his successors make Gnostic heresy a distinctively Samaritan product, ascribing its beginnings to Dositheus of Shechem, Simon the Magian of Gitta and Menander of Capparatea, but (at least in the *Clementina*) Dositheus and Simon are declared to have been *disciples of John the Baptist*, while Menander, their greater successor, makes the rite of baptism central in his teaching. The Logos doctrine with which Simon combines the Johannine doctrine of the Greater to come after, is said to be Simon's own importation from Alexandria.

The testimony of Luke and the fathers to the Samaritan origin of Gnostic heresy should not be disregarded. In reality Samaria was the oldest and one of the strongest seats of Hellenism in Palestine, a foundation of Alexander himself. For centuries it maintained a vigorous rivalry with Jerusalem as the center of true Hebrew religion and only sank to something like its present insignificance when violently suppressed by Justinian in 529 A. D. because of its opposition to Christianity.

Samaria would seem to have been the earliest dissemination point for that syncretizing development of the reform movement which we may designate in imitation of Harnack its "acute Hellenization." When the first dissemination of Christianity occurred through "the persecution that arose about Stephen" Samaria

again became the first asylum of the refugees. This Christian dispersion was itself exclusively Hellenistic. The Galilean apostles remained unmolested in Jerusalem even when Saul, their chief persecutor, was pursuing men of the type of Stephen and Philip to "foreign cities" such as Damascus (Gal. 1 17). Philip, Stephen's successor, later the friend of Paul, whom a parallel tradition makes the evangelizer of the entire plain of Philistia and even (indirectly) of Egypt and Ethiopia, carries the gospel first of all to Samaria. Thence, after Peter and John have superseded his activities, Philip withdraws to Caesarea, where the early Travel Document reveals him in close relations with Paul (Acts 21 8); whereas his fame as founder of the Caesarean church (8 40) has been completely eclipsed in Acts 10 1–11 18 by the greater fame of Peter.

By the testimony of Paul and Acts alike, then, the first Christian dispersion and dissemination of the gospel were Hellenistic, though the later dispersion occasioned by the persecution of Herod Agrippa in 42 A. D. submerged its churches at least as far north as Antioch. After the controversy with Paul at Antioch about 46 A. D. Petrine influence, it would seem, remained dominant throughout Syria. But the agreement of Paul, Acts, and the heresiologues shows that even this first wave of Hellenistic Christian propaganda was itself preceded by a syncretizing propaganda of Gnosticizing "disciples of John." Philip encountered it in Samaria. But neither he nor "Peter and John," who, as Luke relates, took over the conflict, were a match for Simon the Magian and his adherents. A century later Justin Martyr, himself a native of Neapolis-Nablous, reports the whole region given over to the delusion of Simon. Thus "the church in Samaria," which momentarily appears in Acts 1 8; 9 31, as the firstfruits of Christian evangelism, disappears almost at once (Caesarea excepted), eclipsed by Gnostic heresy. Ephesus narrowly missed a similar fate. Aquila, Priscilla and Paul were perhaps more tolerant, or better diplomats, than Philip, Peter, and John the Son of Thunder.

When we take up the relatively late witness of the fourth Gospel to "the disciples of John," with its peculiar emphasis on the relation between Jesus and his great forerunner, certain features

of its geography (made clearer by recent archaeology) corroborate our inferences from Acts. The peculiar anti-baptist polemic of the fourth Gospel is not, I think, completely accounted for after the manner of Baldensperger and his school. It is due to something more than the chance survival at Ephesus of a sect of Hemerobaptists, even if we add the persistence in Syria also, down to the period of the *Clementina* (ca. 200 A. D.) of a sect which claimed the title of Christ for the Baptist, combining it, perhaps, with an Alexandrian Logos doctrine (*Clem. Recogn.* I, 54; cf. Jn. 1 6–8). The horizon of our fourth evangelist is wider. His apologetic is directed against all forms of redemption doctrine "by water only, and not by water and blood." The Gnosticism against which (as the ancients rightly maintained) he directs his shafts, is distinguished to his view from the true gospel by just the fact that it has neither the doctrine of redemption through the blood of the cross, nor the witness of the works and spirit of Jesus. Moreover, whether correctly or not, our fourth evangelist shares the conviction of all the early heresiologues that historically Gnostic heresy is a product of *Samaria*. Correctly or not, he seems to believe, with the author of the *Clementina*, that Dositheus, Simon and Menander, the great Samaritan Gnostics, perhaps Elxai as well from the region "beyond Jordan," do come from the circle of the pre-christian "disciples of John."

In point of fact these Gnostic contemporaries of our fourth evangelist do build upon a false application of the Baptist's prediction of the Greater One to come after, combining it with a Magian Imam doctrine of reincarnation which recalls the rumors of Mk. 6 14 f.; 8 28. In the case of Simon and the Samaritans this is combined with an Alexandrian Logos doctrine which leads their opponents to accuse them of self-deification. All are "baptizers," assigning mystical properties to their rites of lustration. The issue as between them and the Church is that of the significance of John's person, ritual, and message, the nature of his authority, and the meaning of his prediction of the Greater One who should come after. Our fourth evangelist aims, I think, to cut off the tap-root of Gnosticism in general by giving the true "witness of

John," proving thus the falsity of these heretical claims to represent the teaching of the great herald of Christian redemption.

The perception of the ancients that the so-called Johannine Epistles and Gospel aim to refute the heresy of the Gnostics, should therefore be combined with the modern that it aims to correct exaggerated reverence for the Baptist. Both perceptions are valid. But we should add to both the further testimony of the ancients which makes the disciples of the Baptist *in Samaria* chief agents in the "acute Hellenization of the gospel." If the heresiologues be right in tracing Simonian heresy through Dositheus back to John the Baptist it will add a new line of approach of no small importance to our problem of new and old in the gospel. At the same time we shall be much less at a loss to explain why the fourth evangelist should insist with such seemingly misplaced emphasis that John the Baptist "was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness to it," and should prefix to his greatly abbreviated story of the Galilean ministry the story of another earlier and rival ministry between the disciples of Jesus in Judea and those of John in Samaria. In this pre-Galilean ministry, as you remember, Samaria is the disputed ground, where Jesus and his disciples reap a harvest sown by others' toil, a region from which John withdraws, rebuking his disciples for their jealousy on his behalf, while Jesus and his disciples remain masters of the field. According to the Hellenistic Gospel it is in Samaria, after the Baptist's rebuke of his jealous disciples, that Jesus was first accepted as "Savior of the world." Here he abolishes the age-long controversy over the true place of approach to God in favor of world-wide worship in spirit and in truth. Hither he returns in the hour when the shadow of the cross has fallen darkest across his path, to receive welcome and protection in the Samaritan "city called Ephraim."

No small confirmation of ancient references of Gnostic heresy in its beginnings to the disciples of John in Samaria is supplied by recent studies in Mandean literature. There is indeed active dispute as to its antiquity. Reitzenstein and Lidzbarski would carry back its earliest elements to the first century, while Petersen

would regard the whole development of the sect as not earlier than Islam. Much depends on whether its affiliation with Manichean doctrines points to the influence of Mani upon them, or their influence upon Mani. But I suppose none disputes the fact that the Mandeans are, as their name implies, the only still surviving sect of "Gnostics." Neither can it be denied that their principal rite is a baptism "in Jordan" which they profess to derive from John the Baptist, while they hold Jesus in abhorrence as a renegade from John's baptism, and make the Spirit (*Ruhah*), whereby in the New Testament Christian baptism is chiefly distinguished from theirs, the evil and deceptive power.

I do not claim a particular connection of the Mandeans with Samaria because of their equal hatred of Jews and Christians, nor that their baptism "in Jordan" necessarily proves any other original seat than that which they now occupy in ancient Babylonia. I would admit that Babylonian and Persian, or Magian, mysticism may have as much to do with Mandean religious rites and beliefs as Syrian Gnostic syncretism. But whatever complex doctrinal forms current Mandaism may have assumed, its baptismal symbolism coupled with its hatred of Christianity on one side and of Judaism on the other, is a strong confirmation of the uniform testimony of the second-century fathers of the Church that the origins of Gnostic heresy belong to this region.

Back of Antioch on the Orontes, later seat of Menander with his disciples Satornilos and Basilides, lies Apamea, and in the mountain region across the river Marsyas Pliny's "Nazarenes," the Nosairi of today, by whose name the Mandeans still call themselves. Further south "beyond Jordan" spread the baptizing sect of Elxai, who flourished in the fourth year of Trajan and stood in close relation to the Essenes. Samaria, to the west, was the home of Dositheus of Shechem and Simon the Magian of Gitta, reputed disciples of the Baptist, whose successor Menander carried the developed cult to Antioch. How, then, can we disregard the witness of our fourth evangelist, strict contemporary of these developments, when he places the earlier ministry of John in "Bethany beyond Jordan," and the later in central Samaria?

Even Christian tradition, from Jerome's time to the present, makes Samaria the burial place of the Baptist, and his chief shrine. However dubious we may be as to the actual movements of the Baptist himself, the placing of his *disciples* by our fourth evangelist is highly significant. It has at least a bearing on the early spread of Syrian Gnosticism, while the actual survival in Syria and Asia Minor of non-Christian baptizing sects, some in southern Mesopotamia existing in our own day, suggests that European Christianity is but the most flourishing branch of a great religious movement set on foot by the Baptist, marked everywhere by the practice of his initiatory rite. The inclusion by early Mohammedan writers of all alike, Christians, Elkesaites, and Mandeans, under the common term of "Baptizers" (Sabeans) would seem not to lack some color of justification.

On the question of our fourth evangelist's two-fold apologetic, on the one side against Judaism, on the other against an "acute Hellenization" of the message of the Baptist, I must refer the reader to two articles due to appear in the January and April numbers of *The Anglican Review* for 1929. I mention it here only because it exhibits in extreme form that motive of which I have already spoken. For the Synoptic evangelists differ from the fourth not so much in the fact as in the degree of their anxiety to put a right construction on the message of the Baptist. They also differ, of course, in the absence from their apologetic of the anti-Gnostic animus so apparent in John. Nevertheless our first consideration is due to these older and more authentic sources. After noting the attitude toward the Baptist and his disciples characteristic of Mark, Luke, and the Second Source respectively, we shall be better qualified to judge where the preponderance of truth really lies; whether with the second century Mazbotheans and their Mandean successors, who credit the Baptist with the real message of world-redemption; or with the Church catholic, which from the outset has regarded John as a mere herald or forerunner of Jesus, the Elijah who according to prophecy must precede with his preaching of repentance the Coming of the Son of Man.

Mark, certainly a Gentile if not a Roman gospel, naturally pays comparatively slight attention to "the disciples of John." They appear incidentally in the midst of a context (2 1—3 6) which aims to prove the authority of "the Son of Man" (verses 10, 28), the term being introduced suddenly and without explanation. As I have shown in a recent article ("Sources and Method of the fourth Evangelist," *Hibbert Journal* XXV, 1—Oct. 1926—pp. 120—128) this section has an unmistakable but ill defined relation both to Q and to the discourse of Jn. 5. For the Johannine discourse is introduced by a parallel to the healing of the paralytic (Jn. 5 1—9 = Mk. 2 1—12), and closes with a dialogue on this issue of the Authority of the Son of Man, wherein again the "witness of John" plays a conspicuous part (vv. 33—36). In Mk. 11 27—33 this subject of the divine authority of Jesus and John reappears â propos of the revolutionary act of Jesus in purging the temple. In Jn. 3 28—36 the Baptist himself reverses the argument, disclaiming divine authority for himself, asserting it for Jesus. But the older tradition is obviously more historical. Jesus replies to the challenge of the Sanhedrin demanding the authority for his high-handed act by appealing to the admittedly divine authority of John. Indeed the very act itself, not performed on the impulse of the moment but planned, as we may well believe, from the moment that Jesus set forth from Caesarea Philippi, would seem to bear the stamp of the martyred prophet by as much as it contrasts with all other activities of Jesus.

Malachi, from whom this revolted priest derives chief inspiration, demands the purification of the temple service as the first condition of Yahweh's reconciliation with his people (Mal. 1 6--2 9; 3 3 f.). Was not Jesus lifting the fallen banner of the martyred prophet quite as much in this death-defying act of prophetic "authority" as when in Galilee, after John was put in prison, he renewed the dangerous cry, "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand?" At least the people in both cases saw and recognized the authority of a prophet, not "of men" but "from heaven."

But to Mark the question of Jesus' authority as Son of Man is not relative to John's but absolute. He discusses it in that

section (Mk. 2 1—3 6) which we have already seen to be echoed in Jn. 5. But we must go back of Mark to the Q material to see the real relation of this section to anti-baptist apologetic. For while the great comparison of the Baptist's ministry with that of "the Son of Man" drawn in Mt. 11 2–19 and Lk. 7 18–35 from their common source is omitted as a whole by Mark, as we should expect, nevertheless he shows acquaintance with it not only in the section on John's baptism, where the whole description of the Baptist as the Elijan "anointer" of the Christ as well as the wrongly ascribed quotation from Mal. 3 1, is derived from it, but equally throughout 2 1–22, where incidents and phraseology alike rest upon Q. Jesus forgiving sins as "Son of Man" with authority even "on earth," Jesus associating with "publicans and sinners," Jesus rejecting the ascetic practices of the Pharisees and "the disciples of John," Jesus as the Bridegroom, surrounded by the "sons of the bride-chamber," Jesus pointing to the futility of the attempt (of the disciples of John) to patch the old garment of Judaism, or to confine the ferment of the message of the kingdom in its outworn wine-skins—these are so many echoes of the Q theme of the Elijan forerunner and the Redeemer of Israel depicted in Isaiah, held up before Israel in "the Prayer" of the Eighteen Benedictions.

This question of "The Q Section on John the Baptist and the *Shemoneh Esreh*" has been already so fully discussed in my article thus entitled in this Journal for 1926 (Vol. XLV, 1/2, pp. 23–56) that it should here suffice to recall the fact that the principal motive of the section is to rebuke the wilful blindness and deafness of Israel in rejecting the testimony of God's two messengers. To quote from my former statement,

> Fragment 14 (Message of the Baptist) is . . . a *mise en scène* for the principal subject, the Denunciation of Fragment 15. This is directed against unrepentant Israel, which had turned a deaf ear to God's two messengers, the Baptist with his warning of impending wrath, and Jesus with his winning invitation, rejected by all save Wisdom's children.

But if the principal aim is directed against unrepentant Israel it is none the less clear that a subordinate aim is that of setting

Jesus and John in right relation to one another. As Mark and Matthew fully appreciate, the appeal is to the "mighty works" of Jesus, reminding us of the thaumaturgic duels of Peter and Paul with "magians." Had they been performed in heathen cities these would long ago have repented in dust and ashes. To Mark the mere marvellous power of Jesus is sufficient proof of his authority as Son of Man. In Jn. 10 41 it is applied in explicit contrast to John, who "did no miracle." In Q the consideration is deeper. The works of healing and beneficence are proof that the "consolation of Israel" prophesied by Isaiah has come. Their character and kind, not the mere demonstration of superhuman power, are pointed to. As gifts of the Spirit they serve to prove Jesus' relation to God. Evil speaking against "the Son of Man" in his own person is not blasphemy, but, his work being done "by the finger of God," opposition to it is an unforgiveable sin. He is the Redeemer predicted by Isaiah. Only wilful blindness can fail to see that when the deaf hear, the blind see, the lame walk, the dead are raised up, and the poor have glad tidings proclaimed unto them the kingdom of God is already overthrowing that of Satan, it has overtaken unawares the blind guides of Israel. This is Q's apologetic against Judaism. It does appeal to the Isaian promise and its echo in the *Shemoneh Esreh.* The chief object is to prove that the power of God was "with" Jesus to heal as against the slanderous accusation of collusion with Beelzebub. As compared with this main intent the *mise en scène* of the question of John's disciples is merely a *mise en scène*, one of those dramatic backgrounds which, as was shown, are a characteristic device of the Second Source for introducing its great discourses.

And yet why use this particular *mise en scène*? Why develope at such length the contrast in mission and mode of life between the Baptist and "the Son of Man?" Why in particular accompany the message reporting the mighty works witnessed by the messengers with the enigmatic saying "Blessed is he that shall not be stumbled in me," if not for the benefit of disciples of John as yet unconvinced? I cannot but agree with critics who hold that

we have here a two-fold apologetic directed primarily against unbelieving Israel, but also not forgetful of the need of applying the testimony of the "gifts of the Spirit" to disciples of John still reluctant to be convinced.

But the nature of the proof shows that even Q does not supply us with a primary Christology. Not only is the title Son of Man introduced here at a point which makes it historically incredible, and in a manner which proves it already a stereotyped expression of the evangelist, it is also apparent that the famous prediction by the Baptist of the Greater One to come after is here given a meaning foreign to the Baptist's intent. In the preaching of the Elijan prophet the Coming One (ὁ ἐρχόμενος) is the executioner of divine judgment, the Angel of the Covenant, unforgiving of sin (Ex. 23 21), whose winnowing fan is in his hand to purge his threshing floor, burning up the chaff with unquenchable fire, gathering the wheat into his garner. "The works of the Christ" of which John has heard can hardly have impelled him to put the question, "Art thou he that should come?" in the sense of this picture. Whether because our precanonical evangelist aims to correct the sense John really gave to the term, or whether he actually regarded the Baptist as looking for a redeemer of Israel of the type depicted by Isaiah and the *Shemoneh Esreh*, the two conceptions are obviously distinct—and the title "Son of Man" is used to cover both. Manifestly we are not yet at the beginning of the development. Perhaps more can be learned from Mark.

We have seen that Mark reduces to a mere skeleton the Q account of the preaching of John, the baptism of Jesus, and the temptation story which interprets the divine vocation "Thou art my Son." He prefaces the second division of his subject with another vision story which correspondingly interprets the story of Jesus' martyrdom, revealing to Peter and the two martyred sons of Zebedee their gospel of the resurrection of "the Son of Man." This vision and *bath qol* present nothing less than a complete Christology; but in spite of certain superficial resemblances this Christology is *not* that of the baptismal vision. In view of

its close adaptation to Is. 42 1–4 (cf. Mt. 12 18–21) the Christology of the baptismal vision can only be called an Isaian or "Servant" Christology. The *bath qol* of the transfiguration on the contrary interprets the title "Son of God," but only in a sense appropriate to that of Son of Man, an apocalyptic sense quite without reference to the Isaian doctrine of the "suffering Servant." The superficial resemblance in the single word "my Son" is not original, but is due to accommodation. The source employed in the story of the baptism adopts it in preference to "Servant" implied in the basic passage; this appears from the sequel, the temptation story, which explains its meaning.[2] The tradition in its original (oral?) form must have used the term Servant (παῖς) in the *bath qol*, as in the quotation Mt. 12 18 (cf. Is. 42 1–4). The transfiguration *bath qol* has in view the "prophet like unto Moses" (Dt. 18 15), to whom all obedience is due. Its Christology is distinctly apocalyptic, not a "Servant" but a "Son of Man" Christology.

Moreover the Son of Man Christology displayed in the transfiguration vision is not only independent of the Servant Christology based on Is. 42 1–4, but beyond question prior. Even if we disallow the evidences of assimilation revealed in the substitution of "Son" for "Servant," and disregard other indications, the evidences of the earliest preaching would be conclusive. With or without the actual name our earliest record of missionary preaching, Paul's account of his own preaching in Thessalonica (1 Thess. 1 10) and parallel examples, is based on an apocalyptic "Son of Man" Christology. Such is the foundation of the earliest Christian belief, such the gospel which it promulgates. Its missionaries do not propound the better ethics of the Sermon on the Mount, they proclaim "the word of the cross," the doctrine of the resurrection, the "taking up" on the third day, and the Coming again to judgment.

Not that the Servant Christology is not early. It is so early that Paul himself can speak of it in 1 Cor. 15 3 as "received" by

[2] The second epithet should be read, as in Lk. 9 35, "my chosen" (ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου), the change to "Beloved" (ἀγαπητός) is due to assimilation, as in the case of παῖς and υἱός.

him when he first became a Christian. Our two Lukan writings are saturated with it, and have even four occurrences of the elsewhere almost unknown title "the Servant." Traces of the Isaian conception appear in Mark, and, as we have seen, even the Q material already employs the title Son of Man almost as an equivalent for "the Servant." Jesus himself might conceivably have used the Isaian conception to correct too grossly apocalyptic interpretations of the Son of Man doctrine.

Nevertheless the earliest intimations are all opposed to Jesus' application of the figure to himself. Not "the Servant" but "the Son of Man" is Jesus' self-designation, not indeed "favorite," as our evangelists would make it, but ultimate. Uniformly the identification of him with the Isaian suffering Servant is represented as a post-resurrection discovery. It comes as a revealing light from heaven to drive away the despair of the discouraged disciples by a sudden realization, based not on any remembered saying of Jesus, but on "the Scriptures" that "it must needs be that the Christ should suffer and enter into his glory." *After Calvary* they discover that thus "all the prophets had spoken." It has indeed been often maintained that the Servant doctrine is implied in the eucharistic utterance "my blood shed for *many*," adapted in Mk. 10 45 ("a ransom for many") to emphasize the teaching of service as the measure of greatness in the kingdom. But neither in Mk. 14 24 nor in Mk. 10 45 should Is. 53 11 be resorted to as the example in mind. The closest relation of the phrase is to current conceptions of Moses' intercession for sinful Israel. Moses' putting his own life in pledge for the forgiveness of the people's sin (Ex. 32 32) is spoken of in rabbinic sources as an offering of himself "the one for the many." Jesus' own utterances, on the contrary, seem to apply the Isaian figure of the Servant to Israel, which we know was both the correct and the usual application of his time. To Jesus "the Servant" is the victim "blind and dumb" that must be roused from the lethargy of despair in order to become Yahweh's "witness" to the nations. If he spoke of his own exaltation it is less likely to have been in the sense of Is. 52 13; 53 12, although these seem to

control the thought of Paul (Phil. 2 9–11), than in the sense of Dan. 7 13.

We cannot, therefore, but regard the "Son of Man" Christology of the transfiguration vision as more primitive than the "Servant" Christology of the Markan prologue and the Q source. Indeed such traces as remain of primitive gospel story, as in 1 Cor. 11 23–26 and 15 1–8, indicate that the beginnings of the Son of Man doctrine were with the via crucis rather than the Galilean ministry. The Q document is generally admitted to have concerned itself at least primarily with teaching a "wisdom" of God revealed through Jesus. The source from which Mark derived his story of the transfiguration (for the inarticulate way in which Mk. 9 2–10 is thrust into the context shows clearly its alien origin) dealt with the story of the cross and resurrection. The two "witnesses" who appear "in glory" with Jesus on the high mountain are not representatives of "the law and the prophets" according to a favorite, but purely modern, conception. This Moses and Elias are "the men that have been taken up," whom survivors to the last day are to behold, according to 2 Esdras 6 26. They are "paradigms of incorruption" (*προοιμιάζοντες τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν*) according to Irenaeus and "the Elders" (*Haer.* V, v. 1), "manifested" to the spiritual eye by special grace for the encouragement of believers, as in the opening paragraphs of the *Apocalypse of Peter* (*Rev. Petr.* 4–13). Peter in his folly (cf. Mk. 8 33) would construct an earthly paradise for the denizens of the heavenly. "Ascended" ones who have already been clothed upon by their "heavenly house" can not be detained on earth by the offer of earthly "tabernacles." Corrected thus by the divine voice the disciples accept their commission to preach this other-worldly redemption "when the Son of Man shall have risen again from the dead." Thus the vision of Peter summarizes and interprets the gospel of cross and resurrection over against the Jewish Son-of-David doctrine as the vision of Jesus at his baptism summarizes and interprets the gospel of his teaching.

But if the Son of Man Christology set forth in the Vision of Peter be older than the context into which Mark has forced it,

and more primitive than the Q source on which he has based his prologue, what shall we say concerning its relation to the "Servant" doctrine?

We have seen that the use of the term Son of Man receives explanation neither in Q nor in Mark. It is adopted in Q as a stereotyped title in the section comparing the mission and calling of Jesus with that of John (Mt. 11 19 = Lk. 7 34). It passes over thence to the corresponding section of Mark dealing with the Authority of Jesus (Mk. 2 10, 28), but it does not agree with the Christology of either. That of Q is a "Servant" or "Wisdom" Christology. We find the term "Son of Man" where the meaning implied would demand rather "the Servant." Mark is equally ambiguous though with stronger disposition toward the apocalyptic sense. The common point of departure is the doctrine of John as risen and due to reappear. This is utilized in Mk. 1 2—8; 6 16—29 to show the correspondence between the Baptist and the expected anointer and herald of the Christ, because, as Trypho declares in the *Dialogue* of Justin VIII and XLIX, "the Christ —if he has indeed been born, and exists anywhere—is unknown and does not even know himself, and has no power, until Elias come to anoint him and make him known to all." With this object in view the Q story of the Baptism is reduced by Mark to a mere description of the Baptist's appearance, clothing, diet, etc., derived from the Q discourse, followed by the prediction of the Greater One to come after with a baptism of the Spirit. Mark then narrates the baptism and *bath qol*, with bare mention of the Temptation, after which Jesus begins to speak "with authority" and exemplify the powers of the Spirit. Next, in a highly legendary account of John's martyrdom (6 16—29), those features are brought out which recall the plotting of Jezebel against Elijah. Finally in 9 11—13 an editorial supplement to the transfiguration vision declares explicitly that John's appearance and martyrdom are a fulfilment of the expectation of "the scribes" that "Elias must first come." Jesus assures the twelve not only that this expectation has been met in the person of John, but that the fate of "the Son of Man" must be like that of the forerunner.

Mark's interest, therefore, admits no question. Both by what he omits, and by what he includes, he shows plainly his purpose to prove that the promise of Mal. 4 5 f., and even the further teachings of "the scribes" concerning the martyrdom of Elias at the hands of the tyrant (Mk. 9 13; cf. Rev. 11 7—13 and Ps.-Philo *Bibl. Antiq.*) had been completely fulfilled.

In the corresponding Q passages we find the roots of Mark's identification of John with "Elias that should come," but in very different connection and application. In the discourse of Jesus John appears as last and greatest of the messengers of God, a prophet, and more than a prophet, because he stands at the threshold of the kingdom now already "at hand," heralding its coming, yet less than the least of those within, who belong to a new order as yet not fully realized. Law and prophets were "until John," but these no longer control. John's baptism of repentance has thrown open a "way of justification" (ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης, Mt. 21 32) to publicans and sinners; men of violence now take the kingdom without asking leave of the scribes (Mt. 11 12 f. = Lk. 16 16). John is the "angel of the covenant" of Ex. 23 20 and Mal. 3 1, sent to prepare the way for Yahweh's coming (Mal. 3 1 or Ex. 23 20) before the coming of Israel into its inheritance. His ascetic life and warning of impending doom to the unrepentant stand in contrast with the genial conduct and glad tidings to the poor of the Son of Man, as the wailing of funeral dirges contrasts with wedding songs. But Israel, which turns a deaf ear to both, like sulky children in the market place, is thus doubly condemned. They ill compare with the Ninevites, who repented at the warning cry of Jonah, and equally ill with the Queen of the South, who came from the ends of the earth to hear a "wisdom" far less than the winning appeal of the Son of Man.

Such is Q's representation of the attitude of Jesus toward John. It does far greater justice to the greatness of the man and to the vital, all-important significance of the movement he set on foot. But it is hard to find in it a single trace of the teaching singled out by Mark as the preeminent thing. In Q John is *not* identified as Elias that should come. The only trace of this doctrine is the

possible allusion to the Elias doctrine in the phrase "taken by violence" in the saying "The prophets and the Law were until John" (Mt. 11 12 = Lk. 16 16). The supplement of Mt. 11 14 "*If ye will receive it*, this is Elias that should come" rests clearly on the authority of Mark. Has the identification of John with Elias, then, no other foundation than Mark's inference from Q?

It has long been observed that the Lukan form of Q exhibits in some passages word for word identity with Matthew, in others wide divergence. Matthew throughout is much more apocalyptic in type, much nearer to Mark, much less disposed toward the humanitarian pathos of Luke. In the Q section comparing the message and mode of life of John with that of "the Son of Man" Matthew continues the rebuke of unrepentant Israel in 11 20–24 with further instances of the "mighty works" of Jesus in view of which the cities of Galilee stand condemned (Mt. 11 20–24 = Lk. 10 13–15). He alters the closing words of the preceding verse, "Wisdom is justified by her children" to "Wisdom is justified by her *works*," facilitating thus the change of order. But he has no room for the exquisite story of the Penitent Harlot with which Luke concludes the description of Jesus as Friend of publicans and sinners.

Yet the story forms an authentic part of the source. Its intrinsic beauty and appropriateness, cannot indeed prove this. But it has suffered by assimilation to Mk. 14 3–9. This appears in verses 37 f. and 46 by the inappropriate addition of the "ointment," and in verses 40 and 43 f. by the belated introduction of the name "Simon." Moreover these touches are probably due to some earlier hand than Luke's; for they lead him to cancel Mk. 14 3–9, which he would hardly do if he had not mistakenly considered it a doublet. A further reason for regarding the story as original in the source is the dependence on it of Mk. 2 1–12 in the paragraph which introduces Mark's parallel to this Q section.

This difference between Matthew and Luke in their sequel to the discourse comparing the mission of Jesus with that of John is typical. Q^{Lk} is humane, Q^{Mt} is apocalyptic. Both in this discourse and in Lk. 4 16–22 a Luke presents Jesus as the Isaian

Servant, anointed with the Spirit to bring the message of consolation to Israel. To Matthew he is the coming Judge who will render to all their due when as Enoch's "Son of Man" he "sits upon the throne of his glory" and pronounces judgment upon the nations "according to their works."

Whether this marked difference in tone be due to changes effected by our canonical evangelists themselves, or to difference in the source (or sources) employed, is not a matter of present concern. We only note that Luke's preliminary chapters (Lk. 1 5 to 2 52), highly Hebraistic as they are, exhibit precisely the same humanitarian interest, the same pathos, the same consideration for the poor and lowly and for women, the same interest in those that quietly wait for the consolation of Israel, as the Q sections and other special material throughout the remainder of this Gospel. And it is generally admitted that the change of style after Lk. 1 1–4 necessitates our ascribing the infancy chapters to some Hebrew or Aramaic source rather than to the evangelist himself.

Let it then be further observed that no other section in all Synoptic tradition advances so far in the direction of the anti-baptist apologetic of the fourth Gospel as the opening chapters of Luke. Where else do we find such solicitude to do full justice to the claims of the Baptist without admitting equality with the Greater One to come after? What other evangelist concerns himself to tell of John's earlier career before he baptizes the Christ? Whence can we imagine these stories of the infancy of John derived, these attendant signs and wonders, these angelic predictions, these hymns of thankfulness to God, if not from among the disciples of John? Strong reasons are given for regarding Lk. 1 34 f., which raises the miraculous birth of Jesus a degree higher than that of John, as an addition of the evangelist to his source. J. Weiss and Loisy coincide in regarding Lk. 1 76 f. as an incongruous insertion between the messianic promises of verses 68–79. Other features suggest that Luke's two opening chapters are taken from sources in which the figure of John occupied a place quite different from that to which he is assigned elsewhere.

And yet what can be made of the angelic prediction in Lk. 1 17 "He shall go before his (Yahweh's) face *in the spirit and power* of Elias" if we do not place it in the same category of assent with reservation as Matthew's "*If ye will receive it*, this is Elias that should come" and the bolder denial of Jn. 1 21 that John was Elias in any sense at all? Surely we must either admit that this introduction to Q^{Lk} is later than Mark's Elias doctrine, or else make it independent of Mark, an identification based upon some unknown source behind them all. So far as Christian adjustment to beliefs concerning the Baptist may serve as guide it is hard to escape the conclusion that this Lukan preface to Q belongs at a date intermediate between Mark and the fourth Gospel.

From our study of the sources and their controlling motives we must turn to inference as to the actual and historical relation of Jesus to John as respects the general question of old and new. Manifestly our chief reliance must be the utterances of Jesus himself, especially as recorded in Q, a source which varies as between the Lukan and the Matthean form, but which is demonstrably prior in at least one of these forms to Mark, which draws from it, and which displays far less than any other of that anti-baptist tendency developed increasingly from Mark down to the fourth Gospel. In the Q description of John's preaching and baptism there is little if any apparent disposition to detract from its priority and independence. Jesus' own eulogy of his great predecessor amazes us by the magnificence of its tribute. The splendid march of its poetic form, advancing from stage to stage of appreciation, is matched—let us rather say inspired—by a dynamic of feeling unaccountable by any such mechanical relation as Matthew suggests in his apologetic explanation of the submission of Jesus to the Baptist's rite. It surely was not merely to "fulfill all righteousness" that Jesus took upon himself the baptism of John. It was indeed a "baptism of repentance", and this occasions the late apologetic of Matthew, and the still later and more apologetic explanation of the Nazarene Gospel. But John's baptism was more. It was a rite of initiation to a new Israel, an Israel inde-

pendent of race, prepared for Yahweh's coming by moral renewal, a rite not hostile to priestly ceremonial, nor to scribal legalism, but destined inevitably to supplant them because of the authority on which it rested. It was, as Jesus said, "from heaven, not from men." It had the authority of the prophet, always superior to book or ritual, because based on the voice of God in conscience, a supreme, categorical imperative. Neither Josephus, nor the delegation from the Sanhedrin, neither priests, scribes, nor Pharisees, were prepared to deny that John was "a good man." At least in the presence of the multitude they would not even deny that he was "a prophet." But they held aloof, they had their own ideals of how Israel should achieve its destiny, and they realized that "the Law and the prophets were until John." Essenes, Zadokites and other revolters from the temple worship might "take the kingdom of God by violence." The loose living Galileans, the publicans and sinners, might hearken to the new prophet; scribes and Pharisees "needed no repentance," they had their "Way of righteousness." But Jesus was not a priest, not a scribe, not a Pharisee, a mere Galilean *am haaretz*. Jesus felt that there *was* need of a new departure. Along with the publicans and sinners, with the "people of the land" that refused conformity to the standards of scribe and Pharisee, along with the "men of violence" he received the baptism of John.

The fundamental truth is that neither John nor Jesus was conscious of introducing anything new whatever. With John especially the message he brought was simply "what all the prophets have spoken." The new departure was a departure from the unsatisfactory present conditions of temple and synagogue back toward the great message of the prophets. Hence when John's voice is silenced behind prison walls and Jesus takes up the message and carries it to his own folk in Galilee he is not careful to make any distinction between his message and John's. He too proclaims "Repent, for the Kingdom of God is at hand." Matthew sees no difference at all in the proclamation. Nevertheless there *is* novelty, there *is* difference, just as there always must be when an old message is repeated by new messengers, a difference of

situation, a difference of personality, a difference of the individual experience, which makes it impossible for any of us, do what we will, to restate the old with the same meaning it originally had.

There is least difference in the meaning of "repentance." John means it in the sense of the ancient prophets, "mercy and not sacrifice," cleansing of heart and not of garments, doing justly, loving mercy and walking humbly with God. The only novelty is that since the days of the old prophets the professional religiosity of the Synagogue has come to eclipse in large measure the religiosity of local sanctuary and temple. Jesus also would restore right relations with God by obedience to an inward law of righteousness, an inward purity of heart, not of hands only. He thinks a merciful Samaritan a better teacher of what God really requires than priest or Levite, for these know how to distinguish between clean and unclean, but turn aside from aiding distress. Mercy and good faith are to him "weightier matters of the law" than tithing of mint and anise and cummin. He is no more conscious than John of saying anything new in this. Both are simply applying the teaching of all the prophets to the conditions of the time. Only, both do it "with authority," and the common people are quick to perceive that there *is* something new, something divine, in this; and yet as old as prophetism itself.

There is much greater difference in the term "the kingdom of God," an unconscious difference between the Baptist and the prophets of old time, a conscious and clearly defined difference between Jesus and John. John makes it the very heart of his message. To synagogue religion it had become somewhat vague and unreal. Sadducees had either reduced it to a merely political sense, or discarded it altogether. Pharisees found it hard to keep it clear of the fanatic nationalism of the Zealots. The Pharisees postponed the kingdom of God indefinitely, until obedience to the Law should justify divine intervention. The apocalyptists echoed the cry of Daniel uttered during the period of storm and stress under Antiochus. They found a certain degree of acceptance with the common people, and John's message bears the stamp of this apocalyptic hope. The term itself is infrequent, I believe,

in the rabbinic writings. John, contrariwise, based his whole teaching on an immediate Coming preceded by the great messianic Judgment.

Jesus repeats the message. Like Amos, like Jonah, like Malachi, like John, he refuses to permit national or racial particularism to set bounds to a redemption whose object is moral. God is able of these stones, says John, to raise up children unto Abraham. "Many shall come from the east and the west, the north and the south," says Jesus, "and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob at the messianic feast, while those who count themselves its heirs gnash their teeth in the outer darkness." Jesus and John alike are only repeating with new emphasis the message of the ancient prophets.

But there is a difference. Not merely in the new emphasis born of apocalyptic hopes shared by both, but a difference clearly defined by Jesus himself, a difference like that all-important iota of the Council of Nicaea. To John the kingdom is imminent, to Jesus it is immanent. John stands at the threshold, a friend of the bridegroom. Jesus and his disciples are wedding guests. John, though greatest born of women, is less than the least of those within, who have already tasted of the powers of the age to come. And Jesus and his disciples have received these "gifts of the Spirit," tasted these powers. They have seen in the work of renovation going on around them the actual presence of "the finger of God." The dominion of God is asserting itself in the freeing of the captives of Satan, the casting out of his minions. The kingdom of God is "among them" and "in them," the seed of the kingdom is already springing up, the leaven is at work.

And the baptism of the Spirit brings not only gifts and powers of the world to come, it is also an "adoption," an inward voice teaching us to cry Abba, Father. That is a phrase not unknown in rabbinic literature, uttered here and there in devout Jewish literature. But with Jesus it is more than a phrase. It is fundamental, characteristic. So much so that it passes over to the Greek-speaking church in Jesus' own Aramaic utterance. Jesus did *not* learn it from John. Nevertheless in his "baptism of the

Spirit" it becomes the first utterance of every new-born follower, "Abba, Father."

This, then, is something new which Jesus added, added from his own personal religious experience. It gives a new meaning to the message of the coming kingdom. It gives faith, and hope and love. So when our earliest source attempts to tell through the time-honored device of midrashic tale the real significance of the baptism of Jesus it begins by relating the vision which came to him as he prayed in the waters of Jordan, how he beheld the Spirit descending upon him, and heard a voice from heaven saying, "Thou art my Son, the Beloved; from all eternity my choice was fixed upon thee." And, when need is felt to define this relation of sonship, the lesson of Jesus' *faith* is set forth. To be the son of God does not involve freedom from bodily want, it does not involve immunity from wounds and death. Israel was taught of old this lesson of faith in the Father; to accept its bread from heaven, to obey without putting God's power to the test. Least of all does the title "Son of God" involve sitting on David's throne to receive the glory and honor of the nations. That is the temptation of Satan. To Jesus it means a love which shrinks from no sacrifice by which God's name may be sanctified, a love whose rule is "thy neighbor as thyself."

I take this interpretation of the spiritual experience of Jesus to be not less true because we can find no evidence that it comes from his own lips. Be it his own utterance, or only the attempt of those who knew him best to tell in figurative language what his individual experience was before any of the Twelve became his followers, his experience as one of those who received the baptism of John, still to me the tale is profoundly true, an explanation—the only adequate explanation—of what makes the baptism of the Spirit something more than a baptism of water unto repentance, something profoundly *new*. "Faith" and "glad tidings"—only by those two words is Mark's version of the message of Jesus differentiated from Matthew's of the message of John. How little! And yet how immeasurably much!

I will not pause to recall to you again the contrast purposely

drawn between the message and life of John and the message and life of Jesus in the great Q discourse on the two Messengers of God and the Stumbling of Israel. The works of the Isaian Comforter, the winning voice of the redeeming "Wisdom of God" are set over against the ascetic life, the Jonah-like warnings of the wilderness prophet with the very object, seemingly, of winning over John's still reluctant disciples to the broader faith. Of this interpretation of old and new in Jesus' relation to John I have already said enough. I must limit myself to a final word on that vital problem but recently discussed in a symposium of our Society in which I had the honor to take part, the question of the title placed by our evangelists in the mouth of Jesus as applied to himself, the mysterious title "Son of Man."

Dalman has taught us, as pointed out before, that the sense in which it appears in the Enoch apocalypse of a superhuman being sitting in judgment on humanity, is on many accounts less likely to have been in Jesus' mind than the sense which it bears in Dan. 7 13, where Israel's representative appears "in the form of a man" brought near to the Ancient of Days that he may receive the kingdom God intends for his oppressed people. It is not as judge but as suppliant that the representative appears. He does not occupy the "thrones of judgment," he stands before them appealing for vindication. The Enoch visions present the figure in a different light. "That Son of Man" whom God has reserved in heaven for the final hour comes to "sit upon the throne of his glory" and mete out reward and punishment upon the earth. This is the figure of "the Son of Man" as we meet it in Matthew, even to the addition of the typical "sitting on the throne of glory." In some passages of Mark also the title seems to involve similar attributes. In others it seems to be used in a sense more like the Danielic. In still others, which in Q seem especially to predominate, the figure which seems really in mind is that of the suffering Servant of Isaiah, exalted and made very high because of his willing acceptance of unmerited death, dividing his portion with the great and dividing the spoil of the strong. In the Symposium my contention was that Jesus did actually

apply to himself on occasion of the taking of the road to Calvary the title Son of Man, but in the Danielic sense of representative of oppressed Israel, coming as a suppliant before the divine throne of judgment to plead for the restoration of Israel to God's favor, and for their vindication. The solemn declaration of Jesus to his disciples that they may cast away all fear because it is the unchangeable decree of their Father to give them the kingdom (Lk. 12 32), the depiction of the prayers of Israel for its coming under the figure of the widow imploring the unjust judge (Lk. 18 7 f.), the promise that before that heavenly judgment seat Jesus will acknowledge those who confess him before men (Lk. 12 8 f.), with many references to the "Day of the Son of Man" seemed to me sufficient to make it conceivable that in the hour when Jesus must either infuse with new courage and conviction the faltering faith of the disciples or lose them altogether, he should have appealed to the figure of the Son of Man in Daniel's vision as applicable to himself. Jesus at Caesarea Philippi was inviting the twelve to share with him the danger of Calvary, must he not have lifted their hopes to a divine deliverance beyond the grave to make them follow him at all? This surely is not incompatible with the messianic consciousness of Jesus. We do not need to hold him responsible for subsequent extension of the term to other contexts where the circumstances show it incredible, nor for its application in the apocalyptic sense which our evangelists, above all Matthew, are wont to give it.

The present study confirms my conviction that Jesus did apply the title to himself, and on the occasion and in the sense suggested in my previous article. We have seen, indeed, that even Q does not carry us back to a time when the title was employed in the sense and manner suggested. Q itself is ambiguous. Its Christology is a "Servant" or "Wisdom" Christology, its use of the title Son of Man is inapplicable and historically premature. Moreover, Mark, though he approximates an explanation by bringing the title into close relation with certain current beliefs concerning the martyrdom and resurrection of the Baptist, adopts from Q its unhistorical use of the title, and leaves us equally in the dark as

to its meaning. Finally, we find no evidence that Mark's identification of the martyred John with the expected "Elias that should come," had any earlier basis than his own application of Scripture and popular belief to the relation of Jesus and John.

Nevertheless Mark has not invented his account of the rumors set afloat by the mighty works of Jesus after John's martyr fate. Mk. 6 17–29 is his own attachment—and a highly legendary one—to the narrative of the three preceding verses (Mk. 6 14–16; in ver. 14 read ἔλεγον "*men* were saying"). These, then, are so much the more certainly pre-Markan; for their continuation is lost. Mark never returns from his digression from the source to tell us what happened in consequence of the rousing of Herod's notice. Moreover we have independent witness to the currency of these pre-christian beliefs applied here to the resurrection and reappearance of John.

Pre-christian ideas concerning the immediate resurrection of martyrs have been covered in part by an article of the present writer in the *Hibbert Journal* for January, 1917 (Vol. XV, No. 2), under the caption "The Festival of Lives given for the Nation." To its citation of 4 Macc. 17 8–22, illustrating the significance to post-Maccabean thought of the Feast of "Renewal" at the turn of the year, might now be added that of the LXX addition to Dan. 3 23 called The Song of the three Dedicated Servants (παῖδες), who walk unharmed in the midst of the fire, accompanied by a fourth, whose aspect is "like unto one of the sons of God." Many allusions in late Jewish and early Christian literature inform us as to what this aspect is. In particular Philo in his adjustment to Greek thought of the Hebrew belief in the "taking up" and "transfiguration" of Moses explains its nature. The great intercessor for Israel finds on his final going up to God that constant vision of the divine glory has changed the constitution of his physical frame "in preparation for immortality." From a twofold constitution it has acquired the nature of "monad," "harmonized into mind of substance like the sun" (εἰς νοῦν ἡλιοειδέστατον; *Vita Mos.* II, 288 (39)). Thus Moses was fitted for the immortality he was to share with the denizens of Paradise.

For Enoch and Elijah had already been thus differentiated in their fate from all other mortals. To these conceptions post-Maccabean belief added the men who, like the martyrs of Daniel and the famous Eleazar (Lazarus) of the Maccabean books, had voluntarily "given their bodies to be burned" (1 Cor. 13 3) for the laws of Mosaic purity and "the sanctification of the divine name." In 2 Esdras 6 26 the seer is explicitly assured that those who "remain after these things" (the signs of the End) "shall see my salvation and the end of my world, and they shall see the men that have been taken up, who have not tasted death (mortem non gustaverunt) from their birth." Of the special speculations regarding the "taking up" of Elias we have abundant evidence in the late interpretations of Mal. 4 6, for which we need only refer to standard authorities such as Volz, Bousset (*The Antichrist Legend*), Schürer, and the *Commentary* of Strack-Billerbeck. It should also be noted that Matthew's version of the rumors concerning the reappearance of the Baptist adds the martyr "Jeremiah and others of the prophets" to the list mentioned by Mark. An entire book entitled *The Assumption of Moses* quoted in several New Testament writings dealt with the relation of the tangible body of Moses to his metamorphosed body of glory.

When we pass to Christian employment of these speculations regarding the resurrection body with which those who have been "taken up" are "clothed upon," we have to observe more than the early use of the transfiguration story in 2 Pt. 1 16—18 and Irenaeus' declaration on authority of the Elders that the Moses and Elias of Peter's vision are revealed as "paradigms of incorruption." The lately recovered fragment of the *Apocalypse of Peter*, as is well known, opens with a development of the same theme. In addition we find the return of Moses and Elias immediately before the day of judgment set forth at length in one of the earliest elements of the Johannine Apocalypse (Rev. 11 3—13), while Justin Martyr shows the expectation of the Baptist's return as the coming Elias, to herald the second advent of Jesus as he had heralded the first, to be still surviving among Christians of the second century (*Dial.* XLIX.).

The Jewish basis of the apocalyptic vision of Rev. 11 3–13 is beyond question. It is true that the Christian editor in the interjected explanation (ver. 8) that the "great city" where the martyred bodies of the two "witnesses" lie exposed is "spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, where also *their Lord* was crucified," adopts them as Christian, making an identification with two Christian martyrs actually killed in Jerusalem shortly before the siege, doubtless James the Lord's brother and the surviving son of Zebedee. But the interpretation of the two "sons of oil," who "stand in the presence of the Lord of the whole earth," of Zech. 4 2 f., 14 as Moses and Elias (ver. 4–7) is unmistakably derived from the well known Jewish expectation (see R. H. Charles, *Comm.* ad loc.). Moses and Elias are now in Paradise. They are "remembrancers" of Yahweh, who plead for his intervention on behalf of Israel. They will appear before the End to effect repentance, but undergo martyrdom at the hands of the tyrant. Their bodies lie exposed to the derision of their enemies, but after "three days and a half" they are reanimated and taken up again to heaven in a cloud, the regular method of conveyance between earth and heaven in Jewish folklore. The Great Repentance follows, with destruction of the unrepentant. Christianized as the teaching here is, it is impossible to detach it from its unmistakably prechristian Jewish base.

Such evidences, with more which might easily be added, abundantly illustrate and confirm the statements of Mk. 6 14 f.; 8 27 f. and their Matthean parallels regarding rumors, current shortly after the beheading of John, by which the preaching and mighty works of Jesus were connected with the expected appearance of Elijah. It is true that no reliable trace appears in Q of the identification of John with this apocalyptic figure. The Christology of Q, save for its inclusion of the unexplained title "Son of Man," is a "Wisdom," or "Servant" Christology. As we have shown elsewhere, this Isaian figure is not primary. Several evidences ranging back in date to 1 Cor. 15 3 indicate clearly its origin *after* Calvary, perhaps specifically with Peter. Among these one of the most characteristic is a Fragment of *The Preaching*

of Peter quoted by Clement (*Strom.* VI, XV, 128), which we may transcribe because of its unexplained relation to 1 Pt. 1 10–12.

> But we, when we had opened the books which we have of the prophets, found, sometimes in parables, sometimes literally and openly, Jesus named as the Christ, and (prediction of) his advent and death, both the cross and all the other punishments which the Jews inflicted on him, and his resurrection and his taking up into heaven before the judgment (?) of Jerusalem, just as all these things have been written which it was needful for him to suffer, and the things which are to follow after. So then, when we had read these things, we were brought to faith in God through the things which were written with regard to him.

It should be needless to point out the special connection of this version of the origin of the resurrection faith with Lk. 24 13–32 and other passages derived from peculiarly Lukan or Petrine sources. The Isaian basis is unmistakable, but equally unmistakable is the fact that we are dealing here only with the resurrection faith of the Twelve (more specifically Peter), *after* the martyrdom on Calvary. The question before us concerns an earlier stage of its development. We have to enquire concerning Jesus' *prediction* of his fate, and his assurance of a triumphant end through some sort of divine intervention, without which we have no explanation of the disciples' actual following to Jerusalem, still less of their return to a rejoicing faith in the risen Christ after a period of utter despair.

On this point Mark alone throws light—or indeed not Mark, who leaves us as completely in the dark as Q concerning the mysterious title which both adopt—but the Markan source, from which are derived both the references to rumors concerning John's martyr fate and reappearance (Mk. 6 14 f.) and the continuation of the story in his account of the beginning of the via crucis at Caesarea Philippi with its accompanying Vision of Peter. Here at last we do find an explanation of the self-designation of Jesus as "Son of Man," not from Mark, but from some earlier source which in the Vision at the Baptism assimilates it to its own Isaian Christology. The greatest of all Christian doctrines, the martyrdom voluntarily incurred by Jesus in a faith ultimately triumphant,

the doctrine of the cross and resurrection by which the twelve were rallied to become his witnesses to the world, has also its roots in earlier beliefs. Before Jesus took the road to Calvary, after he had been forced into exile by the threat "Herod will kill thee" (Lk. 13 31), rumors had come to his ears of what men were saying about the reappearance of the martyred prophet. Had they any effect upon his mind? Did he in any way sympathize with the apocalyptic beliefs which inspired them? Nothing is more difficult than to say just how literally Jesus interpreted the apocalyptic teachings of the prophets. But nothing is more certain than that he gave them real adhesion. If he deliberately dedicated himself to a fate like John's, setting his face toward Jerusalem with clear-eyed apprehension of the bloody end awaiting the messengers of God who should carry the call to repentance to the city that stoneth the prophets (Mt. 23 34–36 = Lk. 13 34 f.), he surely did not take the road of martyrdom without having John's fate as well as John's message in view (Mk. 11 27–12 12).

Did he in any sense give countenance to the current identification of John with "Elias that should come?"—He surely accepted in *some* sense the promise of Mal. 4 6, however reconciled in his own mind with the fact that he had himself known and revered the actual John in the flesh, even while the apocalyptic Elias must be assumed as existing in Paradise. If he attached value to the faith which regarded John as "taken up" in preparation for the Day of the Son of Man, it could only be with some such reservation as the Matthean modification implies: "*If* ye will receive it." In like manner we are sure that he expected to receive the kingdom on behalf of his "little flock," even if a cross should be the road by which he came into the presence of the Great King. He surely accepted in *some* sense the Danielic vision of the Son of Man brought before the Ancient of Days to receive it. If he carried on the work of the martyred herald of the kingdom borne on by the assurance that God would not suffer the cause to fail, then Scripture at least offered no other symbolic figure for one who would still advance the work of John save this—the Son of Man.

It is true that it could be only "in a sense" that Jesus could apply to himself the figure of a being held to be, even while he spoke already in Paradise, waiting since centuries for his mission of redemption for Israel. It is true that the mission of redemption contemplated in his preaching in Galilee tends away from, rather than towards the apocalyptic type of John's preaching. It is true that *if* Jesus appealed to the prophecy of Daniel it was not as a "favorite" self-designation, and that the extension of it by our evangelists in time both forward and backward exaggerates the frequency of its use by as much as it changes its character.

But at Caesarea Philippi the character of Jesus' ministry did change, and that by dire necessity. Galilee had shut him out. A ministry among Gentiles, Mark to the contrary notwithstanding, was something to which Jesus felt himself to be "not sent." He must choose between abandoning the work he had taken up "after John was put in prison" or continuing it in Judea—with the fate of the Judean prophet before him. If the figure which now sustains his faith is no longer that of an Isaian comforter of Israel, but a Danielic, the figure of the mysterious Son of Man, who shall wonder at the change? This too was both old and new.

Christianity found earlier expression for its fundamental convictions, and more plastic, in its two sacraments than in any written form. In baptism it is hardly possible to deny the adaptation of the Johannine rite. I have now ventured to add a relation of the eucharistic supper also to the message and fate of John. The second part of gospel story is dominated by this theme of martyrdom and resurrection. It is an interpretation of the supper itself in which the sure promise of reunion in the kingdom of God stands out as a background through the sacramental developments of superimposed Pauline theology. What of this adoption of pre-christian beliefs applied primarily to John?

We are not here concerned with the later developments. It was only a post-resurrection utterance through the revealing voice of some prophet inspired by "the spirit of Jesus" that attached to the borrowed rite an express authorization from the risen Lord (Mt. 28 19). The earliest references merely note the use of baptism

as an initiatory rite placing the believer under the protection of the name of Jesus. The use of the supper is similar. The theology of the Isaian "Servant" doctrine soon masks the earlier conception, a conception which treats it as paralleling the redemption feast of Passover, foreshadowing the heavenly banquet of "the kingdom of God." But we are speaking of pre-christian influences operative not directly upon the disciples, who are quite unconscious of any thing of the kind, but only of influences which affected them indirectly through Jesus himself. And when we trace the record of the via crucis, in particular as it is summed up in the symbolism of the supper, we cannot but believe that in Jesus' own mind thoughts of John were in the foreground. John's prophetic summons of Israel to repentance, John's bold prediction of the prompt coming of the kingdom, John's demand for a new Israel, prepared for the new era not by racial prerogative, not by legal observance or ritual form, but by moral conformity to the law written upon the heart—these must have given place to thoughts of John's divine mission, his bloody fate, and the "taking up" of the prophet in preparation for the redemption soon to dawn. Surely these also played a part in directing Jesus' own choice of the same road of obedience unto death, and in confirming the unconquerable faith by which he won his victory even over the last enemy.

Whether in Galilee or Jerusalem Jesus, in the fulfilment of his ministry, was conscious of no distinction between new and old. Least of all was he disposed to minimize the part of the last and greatest of the prophets to magnify his own originality. He took over John's message and extended its application. He volunteered to share John's fate and applied its significance to his own "little flock." He had no consciousness whatever of novelty, only of consistency. Neverthelness all that he took over became new—new with the inevitable stamp of his own great personality and religious experience, supremely great because so supremely simple. Our evangelists endeavor to make clear the difference between baptism in the sense they had learned from him and the baptism of John by calling his the baptism of the Spirit. They do well.

A noble interpreter of the Philosophy of Loyalty in our own times has similarly made this the distinctive thing in our religion. According to Josiah Royce also Christianity is distinctively "the religion of the Spirit." It was so to Paul and to the first believers. It became so because of the impress of Jesus. He may, or may not, have used the saying twice imputed to him in Acts and conflated by Mark with John's warning of the coming baptism of fire, "John baptized indeed in water, but ye shall be baptized in Holy Spirit." The deeper fact can dispense with the verbal testimony. The redemptive power he beheld accompanying his work was to him an assurance that "the power of God" was not a mere hope for the future, but the witness of a present kingdom, a kingdom of Sonship, in which his own place was simply that of "elder brother" (Rom. 8 29 f.). He was perhaps indifferent as to the continuation of the rite he himself had submitted to—we could hardly account otherwise for Paul's depreciation of it in 1 Cor. 1 17. But when his disciples did adopt it that was a just appreciation of the newness Jesus had given it when they made it a rite of "adoption" and named it from their own and his experience a baptism of "the Spirit."

And the cup of the covenant in his blood, the pledge by which he made them sharers with him in the kingdom his Father had "covenanted" to him, just as they had shared in his trials, this also was a "new" covenant, not like that of the first redemption out of Egypt, not even like that of the redemption to which Israel still looks forward at every Passover season, but a covenant of present fulfilment, a covenant written upon inward tables of the heart, not only making possible the obedience of love, but bringing an assurance also from the forgiving Father to his repentant sons, "Your sins and your iniquities I will remember no more."

E

THE PLACE OF JESUS IN THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF HIS DAY*

SAMUEL S. COHON
HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

UNLESS the ghost of non-historicity be raised, the conclusion is unavoidable that Jesus spent his brief life-span as a Jew among fellow Jews. Neither his words nor his acts suggest that he personally seceded from the faith of his fathers or that he consciously organized a separate body that would take its followers outside of the Synagogue. Whatever his views of his personal mission, he lived, labored and died a Jew.

Our uncertainties begin when we seek more detailed light on his relation to his fellow-Jews and on the place which he occupied in the religious life of his day. Here we are baffled by the familiar difficulties of the legendary and confused character as well as of the paucity of the sources. A few clear-cut statements in the Talmud might have dispensed with many guesses. But history was not the province of Rabbinical literature. Where we look in vain for information on the Maccabees, on the schools of Hillel and Shammai, or on a Bar Cochba, we can hardly expect to find a clear account of the central figure of an antagonistic religion. The few scraps bearing on Jesus are more valuable psychologically as evidence of the reaction of the leaders of the Synagogue toward the early

* New Testament quotations in this paper are taken from James Moffatt's translation.

Church than as historical testimony of the life and character of Jesus.[1] Where the Talmud is invaluable for the student of Christian origins is in the evidence which it furnishes concerning the social and religious conditions and tendencies of the age of Jesus and his disciples, evidence which is indispensable to correct and to supplement one-sided impressions produced by Josephus and the New Testament.

Neither are we on terra firma when we turn to the Synoptic Gospels. Here, too, we deal not with objective history but with Tendenz-Schriften, which more frequently reflect the faith of the early Church and its antagonism toward the Synagogue than the actual facts about Jesus. Judging by the earnest discussions of moot questions relative to Gospel sources, no royal road has thus far been laid through these mazes that might lead us directly to the historical Jesus. Whatever conclusions are drawn on the basis of the Synoptics are consequently not wholly free from subjective judgment and must be considered provisional.

I. THE MESSIANIC PORTRAITURE OF JESUS

The cumulative testimony of the Apostolic age is that the appearance of Jesus was in the first instance a phenomenon in the evolution of Judaism. It presented a striking manifestation of, or, as the Church claims, the revelation of Messianism, which historical circumstances rendered fruitless for Judaism and all important as the fons et origo of Christianity. To establish the Messiahship of their hero is the chief preoccupation of the Gospels. While they record many things about him, their information is manifestly cast in a Messianic mould of a type familiar to us from Jewish literature[2]. Accordingly it is well nigh impossible to say where *Midrash* ends and where history begins.

[1] This testimony has been gathered and discussed by J. Klausner in the opening chapter of his work on *Jesus of Nazareth.*

[2] Not only the Apocalyptic writings but even so philosophical a work as the Wisdom of Solomon contains a picture of the righteous man who suffers for the sins of his generation, which has much in common with the ideal of the Messiah. It is interesting to note that he is called God's son. See Ch. 2 12–20.

The Messianic pattern employed by the Synoptists in the portraiture of Jesus is a composite one. The Davidic, Prophetic and Priestly Messianic characters are here blended into a unity. His birth at Bethlehem, his consciousness of special authority, his selection of the Twelve, corresponding to the twelve tribes of Israel, his mysterious deeds, his dramatic pilgrimage to Jerusalem, his crucifixion as King of the Jews, and his resurrection, are presented as incidents in the progress of Jesus from the earthly to heavenly Messiahship.

How indelibly Messianism is impressed upon the Gospel narratives may be judged from their reports of the conceptions which the people formed of Jesus. Mark and Luke inform us that he was taken for John the Baptist, for Elijah, and for "one of the prophets". Matthew adds that he was identified also with Jeremiah.[3]

The "one of the prophets" is evidently an allusion to Deut. 18 8 which predicts the rise of a prophet like unto Moses.[4] Matthew conceives the role of Jesus as that of a prophetic lawgiver transcending Moses. At first sight we are tempted to regard these identifications as having been suggested by the prophetic character of Jesus. More careful inspection yields different results. The identification with Moses can be understood in the light of the apocalyptic "Assumption of Moses."[5] Here not a Davidic Messiah but Moses plays the central role in the Divine Kingdom, which is to be ushered in by God Himself after a day of repentance. Moses was created before the foundation of the world to serve as the mediator of His covenant. He fed the people, and in great compassion guided them on their way, and daily interceded in their behalf. He was "God's chief prophet throughout the earth, the most perfect teacher in the world." His relation to the people of Israel did not terminate at his death. He was appointed by God to continue as their intercessor in the spiritual world. Seventeen

[3] Mark. 8 27–30; Matt. 16 13–20; Luke 9 18–21.

[4] Cf. Mark. 9 3 and parallels. Cf. also Acts 3 22 and 7 37.

[5] Written, according to Charles, between the years 7 and 70 C.E. See *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* II, p. 411.

hundred fifty years after his death (c. 75 to 107 C. E.) God Himself will intervene in their behalf.[6]

In the Midrash, Jeremiah figures as a second Moses. Supposed parallels of every important event in the career of one are traced in the other.[7] Quite naturally the Messianic character of the one was transferred by some people to the other. As to Elijah,[8] before coming to figure as precursor of the Davidic Messiah, he was presented in Malachi as the direct herald of the Kingdom of God. As such he also appears in Sirach.[9] John theBaptist's proclamation of the dawning Kingdom of God seems Messianic.[10] Luke states expressly that under the influence of Messianic expectations "Everybody thought to himself about John, 'can he be the Christ'?"

Many of the dramatic words and acts of Jesus' ministry, while appearing prophetic, therefore seem to have been intended to demonstrate his qualifications as the Messiah.[11] His prediction

[6] Assumption of Moses 1 14, 17; 9 9ff.; 11 16; 12 6; 10 11ff.

[7] *Pesikta of Rab Kahana*, ed. Buber, XIII: 36 and *Yalkut Shimoni* on the Torah 919, on Jer. 256 and on Lament. 999. In 2 Macc. 15 12–16 Jeremiah appears to Judas in a dream and delivers to him a golden sword wherewith to crush the foe.

[8] See Ryle and James, *Psalms of Solomon*, Intr. LIV (b) on Elijah and Jeremiah as Messianic types.

[9] Sirach 48 10–11. Possibly also in 1 Macc. 4 46; 14 41 Elijah is meant, though not expressly named. Here he figures in the role in which the Haggadah often presents him.

[10] See C. R. Bowen, "John the Baptist in the N. T.", *Am. J. Th.* XVI (1912), pp. 90–106; "Prolegomena to a New Study of John the Baptist" in *Studies in Early Christianity*, ed. by S. J. Case; also E. W. Parsons on "John the Baptist and Jesus" in the same volume, pp. 129–171.

11 Thus the miracle of the drying up of the fig tree (Mark 11 12–14; Matt. 21 18–19), which astounded the disciples and has perplexed the commentators, becomes intelligible when viewed as a Messianic sign. It is based on Song of Songs 2 13, התאנה חנטה פגיה, literally 'the fig-tree spiceth her figs.' The word חנטה was evidently understood by the Evangelists as meaning 'embalmeth.' As the entire Song of Songs was considered an allegory in which the Messianic drama is the main theme, the drying up or 'embalming' of the fig-tree was naturally taken as one of the portents that had to be fulfilled. Cf. Song of Songs *Rabba ad loc.*, *Pesikta Rabb.* XVII.

of the destruction of the Temple and his cleansing of the Temple are direct imitations of Jeremiah's Temple Sermon (Ch. 7). The latter is also a fulfillment of the purification of the Levites, predicted in Malachi 3 1–5. Jesus often repeats the words of the prophets and reinforces their message. However, his claim is not that he be recognized as a prophet in the sense of being a spokesman of God and a herald of righteousness. He announces no new principle about either God or man that would rank him with the literary prophets, such as Amos, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel or Deutero-Isaiah. He moves on a wholly different plane. Instead of dealing with the problems of Israel in this world, he concerns himself with questions of the world to come. His religious spirit expresses itself in forms familiar to us not from literary prophecy but from apocalyptic writings. Not even his disciples claimed that he was primarily a prophet, nor did the Jewish people refuse him a hearing or Pilate crucify him as a prophet. We are thus compelled to consider the Gospel designation of him as Prophet, like the other designations of King and High Priest, as an attribute of Messianism.

The special authority that his followers noted in his preaching, which was so unlike that of the scribes, consisted according to Mark in his power of casting out demons. He went about preaching in the synagogues and exorcising evil spirits.[12] Selecting the Twelve he likewise dispatched them "to preach with the power of casting out demons."[13]

F. C. Grant rightly concludes that Mark's "portrait of Christ is distinctly not that of a social prophet or leader . . . Instead, he represents Jesus as primarily a religious teacher who is at the same time the Christ, the beloved son of God, the Messiah—but Messiah in a higher sense than the contemporary Jewish leaders understood, the Messiah who came to 'minister' and 'to give his life a ransom for many.'"[14]

Shall we dismiss these Messianic elements in the portraiture of

[12] Mark. 1 22–27; Matt. 4 23ff.; 12 15ff.; Luke 6 17–19.

[13] Mark. 3 15; 6 7; Matt. 10 1; Luke 6 12ff.

[14] F. C. Grant in *Studies in Early Christianity*, p. 259.

Jesus as the pure invention of his disciples and as the mere expression of the faith of the early Church without the least warrant on his own part? Such a claim is not far removed from the negation of the historicity of the Gospels altogether. In view of the persistence of the testimony, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that sometime during his ministry, Jesus grew conscious not only of a unique personal relationship to God but that in addition he came to think of himself as the long expected Messiah. From this consciousness of himself sprang his entire mode of conduct, his sense of special authority in healing and teaching, his peculiar attitude toward sinners and his apocalyptic teachings. The Prophetic lesson, which, in accordance with Jewish practice, he read on the Sabbath in the synagogue at Nazareth, from the sixty-first chapter of Isaiah, he thought fulfilled in himself. It is the ideal which he sought to translate into his life. He felt that the Spirit of God was upon him, that he was consecrated to preach good tidings unto the poor, to proclaim freedom unto the fettered, sight for the blind, liberty to the oppressed, to proclaim the Lord's year of favor. The Messianic era, to which the people eagerly looked forward, was at hand,[15] and he was "its principle agent and predestined head." In keeping with the general atmosphere of secrecy which enveloped Messianism, he avoided speaking of it in public, but intimated it to his trusted disciples in private. Without such a suggestion coming directly from him, it is hardly possible to explain the faith of his disciples after the tragic shock of the crucifixion. While this unique consciousness presents a psychological puzzle to moderns, it explains best the history of Christianity from Apostolic times to the present.

The oldest tradition symbolized the birth of this conviction in the mind of Jesus by the revelation made to him on the occasion of his Baptism in the Jordan. "The Tradition may have been an afterthought arising from contemplation of the later history of Jesus, although the Baptism was a definite point of departure in his ministry."[16] The beginnings of his ministry are connected with

[15] Luke 4 16–21.

[16] Loisy, *The Gospel and the Church*, p. 104. Loisy adds: "In any case,

the activities of John the Baptist. Recent reinterpretations of the relationship between Jesus and John[17] render it plausible to see in John's activity another manifestation of Messianism. Like the Messenger of the Covenant of Malachi and like Elijah of old, he heralded the coming Kingdom of God and therefore called men to Baptism unto repentance. From both Josephus and the Gospels we learn that his appeal met with good response. Even some Pharisees and Sadducees are said to have come to be baptized by him. That Jesus, too, was attracted by John's prophetic idealism is quite possible.[18]

Like Saul after his anointing by Samuel, so Jesus after his baptism by John came to feel himself transformed into a new man. New spiritual powers were born in him. Under the influence of John's Messianic claims, Jesus may have been stimulated to nourish similar aspirations. He soon severed his relations with John and proceeded to further his own mission. In other words, this step was taken not merely because he felt himself cramped by the rigid asceticism and by the baptismal rite of John, but possibly also because of his nascent Messianic consciousness. None the less he retained his high esteem for John,[19] and his disciples could, therefore, consistently subordinate the master to the disciple in the Messianic drama of Jesus, by recognizing him indeed as Elijah, but in the role of forerunner of the Davidic Messiah rather than in that of direct inaugurator of the Kingdom of God.[20]

II. MILITANT NATIONALISM AND QUIETISM

Turning from the Messianic framework of the Synoptics to the concrete data of his ministry, we find Jesus laboring amongst his

the distinction that is drawn between the consciousness of Himself as the Son and as the Messiah is absolutely without foundation. The earliest tradition has no suspicion of it; nor would modern criticism have dreamed of it, had there been no theological interests at stake."

[17] See note 10.

[18] Mark. 1 5; Matt. 3 7; Luke 2 7, 15.

[19] Luke 20 1–8 and parallels.

[20] Mark. 1 1–8; Matt. 17 13.

own people with devotion and determination.[21] He appears to have conceived his mission as being primarily unto Israel in his capacity not only of Messianic claimant but also of healer. Mark states that he had refused to heal the Syrophoenician woman's daughter, offering as his reason: "Let the children be satisfied first of all; it is not fair to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs."[22] Touched by her humility, persistence and faith, he made an exception in her case. Matthew adds the explanation of Jesus: "It was only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel that I was sent."[23] According to Streeter, he had not himself "even on that occasion stepped outside the sacred soil of Palestine—for the woman had come across the border to him."[24] Matthew, while representing the compromise view of the early Church with regard to the conversion of gentiles, concedes that he charged the Twelve: "Do not go among the Gentiles and do not enter a Samaritan town, rather make your way to the lost sheep of the House of Israel."[25] While we can understand how from the standpoint of Judaism he would restrict his religious activities to Israel, we find it hard to comprehend his reason for refusing to heal gentiles or Samaritans. Montefiore comments: "We can hardly believe that, had he not said so actually, had it not been clearly known that he had said so, and that as a matter of fact his activities *were* confined to his own people, such a saying as this could even have been reported, least of all in Mark."[26]

[21] Even Talmudic legend bears witness to his devotion to the Jewish people. See *Gittin* 57a.

[22] Mark. 7 27. The term dog for gentile seems strange in the mouth of Jesus. However, see Matt. 7 6 and comp. Phil. 3 2.

[23] Matt. 15 26.

[24] Cf. *ibid.* 22.

[25] Matt. 10 6. See Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 514, cited by Montefiore, *Synoptic Gospels* II, 358.

[26] *Synoptic Gospels* I, 167. Montefiore adds, after some extenuations: "Klausner says not untruly that Jesus' reply is 'so brusque and chauvinistic that if any other Jewish teacher of the time had said such a thing Christians would never have forgiven Judaism for it.' Yet it is historical, because 'the gospels were written at a time when the disciples of Jesus

The particularism of Jesus had nothing in common with the ultra-nationalistic aspirations of the followers of Judas the Galilean. Together with their devotion to the Torah they combined an all-consuming zeal for liberty. Under no condition would they submit to foreign rule. Josephus informs us that following the reduction of Archelaus's ethnarchy into a Roman province, Judas "urged his countrymen to revolt, and said they were cowards if they would endure to pay a tax to the Romans, and would, after God, submit to mortal men as their lords."[27] His adherents exhibited extraordinary courage. "They also make light of dying any kind of death, nor indeed do they heed the punishment of their relations and friends, nor can any such fear make them call any man lord."[28] They would recognize none save God as their ruler. Lake and Jackson may be justified in their claim that the title Zealot as descriptive of a party in Jerusalem belongs to the followers of John of Gischala, who were banded together about the year 66 C. E.[29] In that case, John only gave organized expression to the spirit which animated Judas and his followers. Galilee was the hot-bed of their patriotic zeal. It was probably due to the agitation of these Galileans at the Passover feast at Jerusalem that Pilate mingled their blood with that of their sacrifices.[30]

Born and raised in Galilee, Jesus naturally came into contact with this left wing of Pharisaism. What his attitude was towards it we are not expressly informed. However, Mark 12 13–17 (= Matt. 22 15–22; Luke 20 20–26) may throw some light on the subject. Here Pharisees, probably of this type, came together with Herodians, i. e. pro-Romans, to interview him about paying tribute to Caesar. Far from seeking to trick him, as the Gospels suggest, these contending parties may have sought to ascertain

included many non-Jews, and when no one would have put in Jesus' mouth so harsh a sentiment,' *Jesus of Nazareth* pp. 294–295. *Ibid.* p. 168." See also Montefiore's comments on page 85.

[27] *Wars* II; VIII: 1.

[28] *Antiquities* XVIII: 1, 6.

[29] The name first occurs in *Wars* IV; III: 9.

[30] Luke 13 1. See also *Ant.* XVII; IX: 3; and *Wars* II; IX: 4.

where he stood on the burning issue of loyalty to Rome and national independence. Did his gospel of liberty for the oppressed apply to his nation? His reply, to give Caesar that which belongs to Caesar and to God what belongs to God, showed that a barrier existed between him and the nationalists.

Lake and Jackson suggest that the doctrine of non-resistance (Luke 6 27—35) should be understood as the direct negation of the patriotic aspirations of the followers of Judas. The words "love ye your enemies" indeed appeared to the mind of the editor of the Gospel as he copied it out of his sources in the light of "the sufferings and persecution endured by Christians; but to the mind of the Galilean who first heard them they must have seemed to be the direct opposite of the patriotic teachings of the school of thought started by Judas of Galilee, and to be deliberately intended as an alternative to it."[31] "Israel was called on to suffer under Roman rule, and the righteous to endure violence at the hands of the wicked, for that was the will of God, who in his own good time would shorten the evil days."[32]

On this hypothesis, Lake and Jackson account "for the failure of Jesus to convince any large part of the Galilean population," also "for his leaving even the less populous parts of the country and for the secrecy which appears to have attended his journey when he went through Galilee on his way to Jerusalem; for Galilee was essentially patriotic, far more so than Judea, which in the time of Jesus was still under the influence of the Scribes and priests, whose resistance to Rome was essentially passive."[33] The difference in patriotic fervor in the two sections must be taken as purely hypothetical. Jerusalem as the heart of the country registered every agitation and convulsion in the body of Israel.

As from the insurgents of the Pharisaic left so from the Pharisaic right, the quietistic Essenes, Jesus was separated by an impassable barrier. The points of resemblance between them dwindle into

[31] *Op. cit.*, pp. 289–290.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 291.
[33] *Ibid.*, p. 290.

insignificance by the side of the points of difference.[34] Far from being secluded in a special brotherhood and fenced around by a high hedge of ceremonial purity, Jesus mingled freely with the people, shared in the ordinary affairs of life, and participated in joyous festivities and recreations. In contradistinction to the ultra-Pharisaic strictness of Sabbath observance on the part of the Essenes, Jesus scandalized some of his contemporaries by his conduct on the day of rest.[35] He showed great laxity toward ceremonial lustrations, which constituted an essential more distinctive of Essenism than of Pharisaism.[36] The fear of pollution kept the Essenes more than the Pharisees from contact not only with foreigners but also with fellow Essenes of inferior grades. Jesus, on the other hand, consorted freely with publicans and sinners, both male and female.[37] With the exception of celibacy, Jesus was free from ascetic habits. Therein he differed not only from the Essenes and some Pharisees but also from John. His eating and drinking drew the denunciation of his opponents as being "a glutton and a winebibber."[38] One of his first miracles consisted in turning water into wine at a wedding feast; and his last act was the observance of the *Seder*, drinking wine and partaking of the Paschal lamb. Unlike the Essenes who regarded oil as polluting, Jesus rather welcomed its use.[39] Possibly the emphasis on some of these things in the Gospels is intended to show his dissent from

[34] The supposed resemblances on further examination appear to come from the common stock of Jewish religious idealism rather than from direct affiliation. We refer to the elements of simplicity and brotherly love, to the prohibition of many oaths and to the respect paid to poverty. These elements appear among the *Ḥasidim Harishonim*, from whom both the Essenes and Jesus derived them. Similarly their claim to the possession of the *Ruaḥ Hakkodesh* was common to the *Ḥasidim* and even some Pharisees and was by no means limited to the Essenes. See below.

[35] Matt. 12, 1–12; Mark. 2 23—3 6; Luke 6 1–12; 14 1–6; also 13 10–17; John 5 10–18; cf. 7 22, 23; 9 14, 16.

[36] Matt. 15 1–20; Mark. 7 1–23; Luke 11 38–41.

[37] Matt. 9 10ff., 11 19; Mark. 2 15ff.; Luke 5 30ff.; 7 37ff.; 15 2; 19 7.

[38] Matt. 11 19; Luke 7 34.

[39] Matt. 6 17; Luke 7 46.

these ascetics. With regard to the sacrificial cult, too, Jesus shared none of the Essenic scruples. He accepted it as part of the religious order, shared in it personally and counselled others to do likewise.[40] The whole time of his stay in Jerusalem was spent within the precincts of the Temple.[41] Though repeating the prophetic teaching (which we also find in the mouth of Rabban Joḥanan b. Zakkai) that mercy is better than sacrifice,[42] he also declares that the Temple and altar consecrated the gifts.[43] "Throughout the Gospels," observes Lightfoot, "there is not one word which can be construed as condemning the sacrificial system or as implying a desire for its cessation until everything is fulfilled."[44] Doctrinally, too, Jesus was at variance with the Essenes. He rather followed the Pharisees in the belief of bodily resurrection than the Essenes in their doctrine of the spiritual immortality of the soul.[45]

III. THE PHARISEES AND THE 'AMME HA-ARETZ

To the moderate Pharisaic center, too, Jesus stands in sharpest antagonism. The exact nature of this antagonism is not easy to discern through the fog of bitter hostility which fills the Gospels toward the Pharisees, who proved to be the strongest opponents of the claims of the early Church. Luke retains traditions of friendly relations between Jesus and the Pharisees. He dines at Pharisaic homes and is warned by Pharisees when Herod intends to slay him.[46] Generally the Synoptists present him waging a harsh polem-

[40] Matt. 8 4; cf. Matt. 5 23–24; Mk. 1 44; 14 15–18; Luke 5 14.

[41] Mark. 11 11, 15ff., 27; 12 35; 13 1ff.; 14 49 and parallels. According to Peter, he was accustomed to pay the Temple tax, Matt. 17 24ff.

[42] Matt. 9 13; 12 7. See *Abbot R. Nathan* (Ed. Schechter) I: 4, p. 21.

[43] Matt. 23 16ff.; cf. 5 23–24.

[44] *Colossians*, p. 413. See the entire analysis of the relations of Jesus to the Essenes, *ibid.*

[45] Mark. 12 18ff. and parallels. He not only followed the Pharisees in this doctrine but also their form of exegesis. Cf. *Sanhedrin* 90b. וגם הקימותי את בריתי אתם לתת להם את ארץ כנען. לכם לא נאמר אלא להם. מכאן לתחית המתים מן התורה.

[46] Luke 7 36; 11 37; 14 1 and 13 31.

ic against them, which, if not apocryphal, violated the principle of love which he taught his disciples to apply even to enemies.[47] Instead of praying for them, he generally excoriated them as vipers and sons of Hell. Montefiore remarks: "For them he is never recorded to have uttered any prayer. The famous passage in Luke (23 34) is of doubtful authenticity and probably refers to the Roman soldiers."[48] His hostility toward them, reaching its climax in Matthew 23, can be understood only as the outgrowth of clashing views on matters that lay at the center of his being.

Their refusal to heed his Messianic claim must have been the chief source of friction between them. Tested by their beliefs regarding the Messiah, Jesus failed to qualify. Mark 12 35–37 presents Jesus endeavoring to demonstrate that the Messiah need not be of the house of David. The authenticity of this argument is established by its appearance in Matthew and in Luke, despite their incorporation of genealogies showing the Davidic descent of Jesus.[49]

In addition, they clashed in their respective attitudes towards the Law. We indeed find numerous points of agreement between them. They were of one mind in considering the Unity of God, the love of Him and the love of one's fellowman as the essence of the Torah.[50] They also agreed on the Divine origin and authority of the written Torah, on Retribution and on the Resurrection. And, as we have noticed, he accepted the sanctity of the Temple and the Temple worship. He even followed some of the older provisions of the Oral Law, such as grace at meals,[51] blessings over wine,[52] and the recitation of the *Hallel* at the *Seder*.[53] The prayer which

[47] Matt. 5 44.

[48] *Op. cit.*, II: 81.

[49] Matt. 22 41–46; Luke 20 41–44. Psalm 110 1 was interpreted in a Messianic sense in *Midrash Tehillim*; see ed. Buber, Ps. 18 29.

[50] Mark. 12 28–34. The union of Deut. 6 5 and Lev. 19 18 first appears in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, a work produced during the reign of John Hyrcanus (c. 109–106), and interpolated by an editor (c. 70–40 C. E.). E. g. Test. Issachar 5 2; 7 6; Dan. 5 3.

[51] Mark. 6 41; 8 6; 14 22.

[52] Mark. 14 23.

[53] Mark. 14 26, probably Pss. 113–118.

he is said to have taught his disciples bears close resemblance to the prayers current in Pharisaic circles. That he followed or approved the content of the then current daily ritual appears likely in view of his recommendation of the observance of the Decalogue as a means of entrance into the Kingdom[54] and of his citation of the *Shema* in definition of the leading commandment.[55] From Talmudic sources we know that the Decalogue and the *Shema* constituted the central feature of the daily service at the Temple.[56] While these passages were taken from Scripture, their arrangement in the liturgy was the work of the Scribes (*Soferic*).

In his teaching too Jesus did not wholly escape Pharisaic methods. Like the *Haggadists* among the Rabbis, he takes his lead from the text of Scripture, and pursues the general Midrashic style in developing his ideas. He spices his teachings with pointed proverbs and enforces them with poetic parables. As a Haggadist he naturally discards the prophetic "Thus saith the Lord" for "I say unto you." No self-centeredness or undue individualism need have entered into his frequent use of the first person in his preaching. He but followed the form so abundantly illustrated in the Midrashim and in the Talmud. As a Haggadist, too, he was listened to with joy. The Haggadists were great favorites with the people. Whereas the *Halachists*, like technical jurists and even theologians of today, were followed by the select few, the Haggadists spoke to eager crowds. Instead of dealing with the niceties of the Law, they generally appealed to the heart. They spoke of God, of faith, of prayer, of hope and of the mysterious future. They encouraged the people and consoled them. The Haggadic utterances appear in the pages of the Talmud like oases to the weary traveler.

Whatever difference may be noted in the content of the teachings of Jesus and of the rabbinic preachers, their form is strikingly akin. Thus his monitions concerning anger, lust, divorce and false swear-

[54] Mark. 10 17ff.; Matt. 19 16ff.; Luke 18 18ff.

[55] Mark. 12 28ff.; Matt. 22 37ff.; Luke 10 25ff.

[56] *Tamid* V: 1; *Berachot* 12a; *Jer. Ber.* I: 5 (8). See Rall and Cohon, *Christianity and Judaism, Compare Notes*, Part II, p. 55.

ing take the form of a rabbinic Midrash on part of the Decalogue.[57] The failure to recognize the rabbinic form in which some of the sayings of Jesus are cast, has led to much misunderstanding with regard to the teaching of the Torah concerning hatred of the enemy. Modern exegetes could save themselves a good deal of hair-splitting, if, following the late Dr. Schechter's suggestion, they would view Matthew 5 43 in the light of rabbinic models. Its correct meaning would then be: "You have heard the saying: 'You must love your neighbor.' (From this are you to infer that you may) hate your enemy? I, therefore, declare unto you: love your enemies."[58]

In Halachic matters, too, Jesus shows the influence of Pharisaic modes of interpretation. His construction of Deut. 23 19, as recorded in the Talmud, met with the approval of Rabbi Eliezer b. Hyrcanus.[59] The Gospel records of his teachings similarly exhibit "Pharisaic leaven." As a loyal Jew, he announces that he came not to destroy the Law but to fulfill it.[60] He knows of lighter and of weightier matters in the Law. However, while stressing "the weightier matters", he does not propose the disregard of the lighter. "These latter you ought to have practiced without omitting the former."[61] Like the Pharisees, he seeks to establish "a hedge for the Torah." Where he calls for a departure from the Pharisaic conception of a particular Halacha, he bases himself on a scriptural verse, on some analogy or principle laid down in another law or practice, in a manner reminiscent of some of the exegetical rules of Hillel.[62] For instance he permits anointing the head and washing the face when fasting, a practice forbidden

[57] Matt. 5 21–37. Cf. *Yalkut Shimoni* on Exodus 20 and Lev. 19, or *Midrash Haggadol* to Exodus (ed. Hoffmann) on Decalogue, commandments 5–10.

[58] Matt. 5 43. Schechter, *Studies in Judaism*, 2nd Series, p. 117.

[59] *Ab. Zara* 17a and *Tos. Ḥulin* II: 6.

[60] Matt. 5 17. This declaration has reference to Deut. 13 1. See also Luke 16 17.

[61] Matt. 23 23; Luke 11 42.

[62] See Mielziner, *Introduction to the Talmud*, Part II.

by the Rabbis on *Yom Kippur*.[63] He dissents from John and from the Pharisees with regard to extra fasts on the ground that the friends of the bridegroom are absolved from fasting. As the Messianic King figures in the Midrashic interpretation of Song of Songs as bridegroom, both he and his disciples are not obliged to fast.[64] Similarly with regard to the Sabbath, Jesus resorts to Pharisaic arguments to counteract Pharisaic rules. He justifies his disciples in plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath by an analogy (*Gezera Shava*) from David, who under compulsion ate the shewbread, which was contrary to the Law. Matthew adds another analogy: "Have you not read in the Law that the priests in the Temple are not guilty when they desecrate the Sabbath?" and concludes (with a *Kal Veḥomer*): "I tell you, one is here who is greater than the Temple . . . The Son of Man is lord of the Sabbath."[65]

In the matter of healing on the Sabbath Jesus manifestly departed from the severe blue laws as represented in Jubilees, Chapter 50, and which correspond to the views of the Shammaites. On the other hand, the Hillelites held that where life was in danger, the

[63] Matt. 6 16–18 and *Yoma* VIII: 1. Mark. 9 29 shows that Jesus did lay weight on fasting.

[64] Mark. 2 18ff.; Matt. 9 14ff.; Luke 5 33ff. Rabbinic law exempts the friends of the groom from reading the Shema and from prayer during the seven days of the marriage feast, *Tos. Ber.* II: 9; *Ber.* 11a, 16a.

[65] Matt. 12 1–8, cf. *Sabbath* XII: 2. Dr. Kohler suggests that the incident referred to here was preserved most correctly in Luke. "It was not on the Sabbath, but on the first day of the Second Passover week (called δευτεροπρώτη from the Biblical expression 'the morrow of the Sabbath.' Levit. 23 11–14), when no new corn was allowed to be eaten before some had been offered on the altar, that the disciples of Jesus passed through the field and plucked the new corn, called "*ḥadash*" in rabbinical Literature. In defending their action Jesus correctly referred to David, who ate of the holy bread because he was hungry (1 Sam. 21 5–7)—an argument which would not at all apply to the Sabbath." (Article "Jesus in Theol.," *J.E.* VII, 108). See also Rudolf Leszynsky, *Die Sadduzäer*, 292, n. 1; Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N. T.* II, p. 158. The question at issue in this incident may also be whether or not the sheaf to be waved before the Lord may be reaped on the Sabbath. If this be the case the teaching of Jesus is in agreement with that of the Rabbis. See *Menaḥot* 72a. דוחה שבת [קציר העומר]

Sabbath laws must be set aside. They, too, believed that the Sabbath is handed over to man, not man to the Sabbath.[66] Where life is not at stake the only objection to healing on Sabbath is the preparation of the medicine.[67] In the case of Jesus no such preparation was necessary. It is interesting to note the Pharisaic character of the justification which Jesus offers for his conduct. He argues: "Is it right to help or to hurt on the Sabbath, to save life or to kill?"[68]

On the other hand with regard to divorce Jesus is stricter than the Hillelites, who took a rather liberal stand in the matter. Mark 10 2–12 (= Luke 16 18) presents him as even going beyond the Shammaites in denying the validity of divorce under any circumstance. Basing himself midrashically on Gen. 1 28 and 2 24 he keeps to the ideal of Malachi 2 14–16 that God hates divorce ("I hate putting away"). The compromise view of Matthew 19 1–12 and 5 32 corresponds to the position of the Shammaites, viz. that a man may divorce his wife only in case of adultery.[69]

These agreements with the Pharisees notwithstanding, Jesus stands out as their uncompromising opponent. The guiding principle in his radical disagreement with the Pharisees may be noted in Mark 7 1–23 and Matthew 15 1–20.[70] Asked, "Why do not your disciples follow the tradition of the elders?" Jesus retorts with the repudiation of the principle underlying the tradition. The whole body of ceremonial law as extended by the Pharisees possesses no validity. He brands the Pharisees as rendering God lip service

[66] *Mekhilta Ki Tissa* פקוח נפש דוחה שבת and לכם שבת מסורה ואי מפקחין פקוח נפש בשבת והזריז הרי זה משובח. ואין צריך ליטול רשות מבית דין *Yoma* 84b אתם מסורים לשבת *Tos. Sabb.* XVI: 9–14. John 7 22–23 preserves an authentic Halacha. See also Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar* I, pp. 610–630.

[67] *Sab.* XIV: 2–4, XXII: 6.

[68] Mark. 3 1–6. Cf. the argument of R. Ishmael in *Mekhilta Ki Tissa* and *Yoma* 85a. The argument in Matt. 12 11 is likewise in good Rabbinic form.

[69] *Sifre Dt.* 269; *Gittin* IX: 10.

[70] Mark. 7 15–23 is at variance with the tradition of the early Church as reported in Acts 15 27–28 and smacks of Paulinism. Cf. Colossians 2 20–23.

rather than the devotion of the heart, and accuses them of dropping God's commands that they might keep the tradition of their own invention. While taking over some of their older practices, he refuses to bind himself by their innovations.[71]

Rabbinic sources show that this "tradition of the Elders" was in reality a new institution in the days of Jesus. We are expressly informed that the rule of handwashing before meals was established by Shammai and Hillel.[72] Rabbi Simeon ben Elazar observes "How vastly has *Tahara* (ceremonial purity) increased, for it was but little in aforetime and has now waxed abundant."[73]

It was extended from the practice of the priests (Ex. 30 17–21) to that of the laity. Rabban Gamaliel I justified it on the ground that "not to the priests alone was the law of holiness entrusted at Sinai but unto all Israel."[74] The ceremony was indeed mechanical,[75] but like baptism or ablution in general was considered as a means of sanctification. This was in line with the general tendency of the Pharisees to assume voluntarily greater rigorism than the

[71] T. Herford writes: "If he really gave the practice of corban as an example, and if this be not due to later manipulation of the Gospel material, then the inference is legitimate that Jesus had no close acquaintance with the tradition which he denounced. The tradition of the Elders is of course the Halachah. The alleged practice of evading the fifth commandment is nowhere known in the recorded Halachah (see especially *M. Nedarim* IX: 1 and the commentaries on the passage), and is, besides, entirely at variance with the Pharisaic practice of laying the greatest stress upon honour to parents. If Jesus had any inside knowledge of Pharisaism on its Halachic side he would never have given an example so entirely beside the mark." (*The Pharisees*, pp. 205–06). If the examples of his acquaintance with Pharisaic exegesis which we cited above be correct, Herford's apprehension that this passage has been corrupted amounts to a certainty.

[72] *Sabb.* 14b. The view is also expressed that this institution goes back to Solomon.

[73] *Jer. Sab.* I: 4.

[74] *Jalkut Shimeoni Ki Tissa* 386. Citing *Tana Debe Elijahu.* Though appearing in a later Midrash, the tradition is old. See *Tosefta Ḥagiga* III: 1. In *Ḥulin* 106a handwashing is derived from Lev. 15 11.

[75] *Tos. Terumot* I, : טהרות אין צריכות מחשבה. For the moral aspect of Tahara see *Midr. Hagadol* to Exodus, ed. Hoffmann, pp. 208–09.

Torah requires. They are characterized in the Mishnah as שרצו להחמיר על עצמם[76] and לא מפני שההלכה כן אלא שרצה להחמיר על עצמו[77]. Of the House of Hillel it was said that its members subjected themselves to extreme rigorism while permitting others to follow a more lenient course.[78] This type of piety, while expressing itself in every phase of religious life, was specially stressed in Sabbath observance, lustrations and ablutions and scrupulous regard for tithing—*terumot* and *ma'asrot.*[79] It was fostered in the Pharisaic associations (*Ḥaburot*) as a superior form of righteousness. Admission to these associations was open to any trustworthy person who in the presence of three associates (*Ḥaberim*) pledged himself to observe the Pharisaic requirements.[80]

While the Pharisees, as Josephus testifies, won the confidence of the people by their austere teachings and piety,[81] there were many who refused to submit to their restrictions. *All such were designated as 'Amme Ha-Aretz.* They did not constitute any particular stratum in the social order. To speak of them as "men of the soil," "farm-owning" or "farm-laboring type," the "ill-bred," the "common herd," or the "uncultured folk" is to grasp at the etymology of the term and to miss its inner meaning.[82] *The use of 'am ha-aretz as synonymous with bor is due to the sense which the term acquired in later centuries*, when Pharisaism converted itself into the religion of all strata of Jewry and when the name 'am ha-aretz, as expressive of a difference from the *haber*, assumed the meaning of ignoramus. Rabbinical literature still retains the differ-

[76] *Erubim* IV: 1.

[77] *B. Mez.* V: 5.

[78] *Beza* II: 6 אמרו לו [לרבן גמליאל] מה נעשה לבית אביך שהיו מחמירין על עצמן ומקילין לכל ישראל. See also *Eduyot* III: 10.

[79] Since the reforms of John Hyrcanus special care was taken in the discharge of these duties. See *Sota* 48a. We hear of the excommunication of Rabbi Eliezer b. Ḥanoch for the conscious disregard of the rule of hand-washing before meals. *Ber.* 19a.

[80] *Bechorot* 30b.

[81] *Ant.* XVIII, I: 3–4; also XIII, X: 6.

[82] Cf. I. Abrahams in C. G. Montefiore's *Syn. Gospels* II, pp. 647–669.

ence between 'am ha-aretz and bor.[83] Neither does the evidence at our disposal justify us in considering them as the poor and dispossessed. Among them we find the entire body of publicans[84] and other men of influence.[85] They probably included the whole Sadducean aristocracy. We hear expressly of priests and even of high-priests who were classed as 'amme ha-aretz.[86] Pharisees who lapsed from their discipline *ipso facto* became 'amme ha-aretz.[87]

Most of the definitions of the 'am ha-aretz, which come to us from second century rabbis, are probably not radically different from those of the first century.[88] Rabbi Elazar holds him to be an 'am ha-aretz who studied Scripture and even Mishna but did not receive personal instruction from an accredited scholar. Rabbi Meir classes a man as an 'am ha-aretz if he does not recite the Shema together with its benedictions.[89] Those who do not put on phyl-

[83] *Abot* II: 5. אין בור ירא חטא ולא עם הארץ חסיד. That these are not synonymous is shown by the following statement in *Bamidbar Rabba* III: 1 ישראל יש ביניהם בני תורה ויש ביניהם עמי הארץ ויש בהם בורים cf. also *Tos. Berachot* VII: 16 ברוך שלא עשני בור. For the discussion of the difference between the two see *Sota* 22a.

[84] See *Bechorot* 31a חבר ונעשה גבאי דוחין אותו מחבירתו. *Tos. Demai* II: 5; see also *Nedar.* 27b–28a.

[85] *Tos. Aboda Zara* III: 3; *Tos. Demai* III: 2. Moore correctly observes that "the notion that sometimes crops up in the books, that the 'Amme Ha-Aretz' were the humble pious in the land, in contrast to the arrogant scholars and the self-righteous Pharisees, a class corresponding to the 'anavim' of the Psalms, is without any better support than the imagination of the authors who entertain it. That among those upon whom the Rabbis and the Pharisees so liberally bestowed the name 'am ha-aretz there were many godly men and women is unquestionable, but that the genuine religion of the Jews is to be looked for in this class is an altogether different matter." Lake-Jackson, *Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. I, p. 445.

[86] *Demai* III: 4; also *Abot R. Nathan* (ed. Schechter) I, XII.

[87] *Demai* II: 8.

[88] For a detailed study of the subject see A. Büchler, *Der Galiläische Am-Ha'Areṣ des Zweiten Jahrhunderts.* See also Strack-Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, II: 494–519.

[89] *Berachot* 47b ascribes the saying to Rabbi Eliezer and omits the word בברכותיה. This omission obscures the significance of the passage. From *Menahot* 99b we learn that the 'amme ha-aretz were opposed to the addition of the benedictions to the Shema.

acteries (*tefilin*) are placed in the same category. Ben 'Azzai considers those who have no tassels (*zizit*) in their garments as 'amme ha-aretz.[90] Rabbi Jonathan includes among them those who do not bring up their children for the study of Torah.[91] Failure to observe the Pharisaic rule of washing the hands before meals and carelessness or conscious disregard of the rules concerning priestly dues (*Terumot*) and tithes for the Levites (*maasrot*) rendered one an 'am ha-aretz.

It is significant that the term 'am ha-aretz designates men who studied Torah and even Mishnah, but who were not personally instructed by an accredited master.[92] We even hear of 'amme ha-aretz who possessed sufficient knowledge to act as teachers to the sons of Pharisees.[93] What is most surprising is to discover the application of the name 'am ha-aretz to a *ḥasid*. Thus the Talmud states "if the 'am ha-aretz is a ḥasid do not dwell in his neighborhood."[94] We are told of a prominent ḥasid (according to another version he was a high-priest) who, while living in accordance with the standards of *Ḥasidism*, had to be instructed in the true laws of ceremonial purity.[95] Accordingly Hillel teaches that "the 'am ha-aretz cannot be a ḥasid," claiming that true piety can be practiced only by the Pharisees.[96]

We may conclude on the basis of these facts that the barrier between the Pharisees and the 'amme ha-aretz was neither social nor cultural, but religious. It consisted in the divergent attitudes toward the so-called "tradition of the Elders," but which were in reality Pharisaic innovations. The 'amme ha-aretz were those who rejected the binding character of these regulations. The barrier vanished as soon as the 'amme ha-aretz subjected themselves to

[90] Jesus appears to have worn *Zizit*. Mark. 6 56; Matt. 9 20; Luke 8 44.

[91] *Sota* 22a. In the parallel passage *Ber*. 47b differences occur in the names of the rabbis.

[92] See also *Demai* II: 11 הבא לקבל עליו, אפילו תלמיד חכם צריך לקבל

[93] *Ibid.*, II: 15 בן חבר שלמד אצל עם הארץ

[94] *Sabbath* 63a אם עם הארץ הוא חסיד אל תדור בשכונתו

[95] *Ab. R. N.* I, XII and II, XXIV.

[96] *Aboth* II: 6; *Ab. R.N.* II: 33 presents this saying in the name of Rabbi Akiba with the important addition ולא עם הארץ חסיד (פרוש).

the rules of the Pharisees. "An 'am ha-aretz who seeks to become a ḥaber, if he previously followed the rules of *ḥaberut* in private, is accepted immediately. Otherwise he has to be instructed first. Rabbi Simon says that he is accepted and taught afterwards. First he is admitted to *Kenafayim*-hand washing and subsequently to general ceremonial purity—*taharot*."[97]

Some of the 'amme ha-aretz were militant in their opposition to the Pharisees. A disciple of Shammai complained that "when you declare a utensil of an 'am ha-aretz impure, he not only disregards the ruling but turns around and says that his is pure but yours is impure."[98] The 'amme ha-aretz seem to have had their own Synagogues, where, we may conjecture, the Pharisaic innovations were not heeded. R. Dosa B. Horkinas (c. 10—90 C. E.) considered the assemblages at such synagogues most detrimental.[99] Their synagogues were mere social centers, devoid of sacredness.[100] Rabbi Akiba testified that in the days when he was an 'am ha-aretz he was ready to bite and crush the rabbis. And another statement reads: "Great is the hatred of the 'amme ha-aretz for the rabbis, far greater than the hatred of the heathen for Israel; and their wives hate even more." The 'amme ha-aretz tested the patience of the rabbis beyond endurance, and drew vehement denunciations.[101] However, the Pharisees did not give up hope of winning over all fellow-Jews to their viewpoint.[102] In *Aboth* of R. Nathan we read: "Say not love the scholars and hate the 'amme ha-aretz, but love them all."[103] "Whoever brings a single creature under the wings of the Schechina is as if he had created it."[104] Teaching the 'amme ha-aretz was, therefore, the ambition

[97] *Tos. Demai* II: 9.

[98] *Ḥagiga* 22b.

[99] *Aboth* III: 10. A. H. Silver suggests that the synagogues of the Judeo-Christians are meant. See "The 'Am Ha-Aretz in Soferic and Tanaitic Times," in *Hebrew Union College Monthly*, Vol. I (1914–15), No. 5.

[100] *Sabb.* 32a ר׳ שמעון בן אלעזר אומר בעון שני דברים עם הארצות מתים. על שקורין לארון הקודש ארנא ועל שקורין לבית הכנסת בית עם

[101] *Pesaḥ*, 49b.

[102] *Ab. R.N.* I: III.

[103] *Ibid.*, XVI.

[104] *Ibid.*, II: XXVI.

of the Pharisees. "He who teaches his friend's son Torah will merit to sit in the Academy on High; and he who teaches the son of an 'am ha-aretz Torah, even if God had issued a decree against him, He will annul it."[105] Hence Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel rules that "laws pertaining to holy things (*Kodesh*), priestly dues (*ierumot*) and tithes (*ma'asrot*) are fundamentals of the Torah (*gufe torah*), and are delivered to the 'amme ha-aretz."[106]

IV. JESUS AS AN 'AM HA-ARETZ ḤASID

The testimony of the Synoptic Gospels makes Jesus an *'Am Ha-Aretz Ḥasid.* As an 'am ha-aretz, he refused to subject himself to Pharisaic innovations. He deliberately broke the rules of washing his hands before meals, he partook of the food of 'amme ha-aretz without fear that it was not properly tithed, and he mingled with all classes of people without regard to ceremonial defilement.[107] Inasmuch as the term 'am ha-aretz covers all non-Pharisees, including the priestly class of Sadducees, Leszynsky is justified in pointing to a certain kinship which existed between Jesus and the Sadducees.[108] It consisted in their common 'am ha-aretz opposition to the "tradition of the Elders." Beyond that their agreement ceased. His construction of the *Lex Talionis* radically departed from their literal interpretation of that law.[109] The Gospels refer to the resurrection as the chief point of doctrinal difference between them.[110] The crucial element of friction consisted in his Messianic consciousness. Socio-political, no less than religious considerations, rendered the Sadducees impervious to his appeal. As Messianic claimant he threatened their regime, endangered the public peace and portended eventual war with Rome. While as Jews they shared the Messianic hope, they saw no more reason than

[105] *B. Mez.* 85a. See also *Abot R. Nathan* I: III.
[106] *Sabbath* 32b.
[107] Mark. 2 13ff.; Matt. 10 10ff.
[108] *Die Sadduzäer*, pp. 281ff.
[109] Matt. 5 38ff.
[110] Mark. 12 18–27; Matt. 22 23–33; Luke 20 27–38. See note 45.

did the Pharisees for identifying the obscure Galilean with the Messiah[111].

While he won over a Zealot and possibly a few Pharisees,[112] he recruited most of his disciples from the inferior ranks of the 'amme ha-aretz. John speaks of them as "the mob, ignorant of the Law;" and the book of Acts describes them as "uncultured persons"—*idiotai*, a term frequent in rabbinical literature for "common folk."[113] They followed the religion of their fathers, as a matter of course, without practicing the austerities and the rigorism of the Pharisees. What distinguished them from the rest of the 'amme ha-aretz was their extraordinary faith in their master. Peter recognized his Messianic character and a few others soon came to share this conviction.[114] In turn he showered his affection upon them and considered them nearer to him than his mother and brothers.[115] Though some of them were sinners, he ranked them above the righteous Pharisees.[116] He prayed: "I praise thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for hiding all this from the wise and learned and revealing it to the simple-minded."[117] He spoke of them tenderly as "the little ones,"[118] and guarded them as a shepherd his flock. He taught them: "Beware of the Scribes! They like to walk about in long robes, to get salutations in the market places, to secure the front seats in the synagogues and the best places at banquets: they prey upon the property of widows and offer long unreal prayers. All the heavier will their sentence be."[119] Matthew adds to this diatribe against the Pharisees: "They make up heavy loads and lay them on men's shoulders but they will not stir a finger to remove them. Besides, all they do is

[111] C. G. Montefiore, *op. cit.*, I, p. CXXIII, and Torrey, "Outcroppings of Jewish Messianic Hope," in *Studies in Early Christianity*, pp. 306–09.

[112] Matt. 13 52.

[113] John 7 49; Acts 4 13.

[114] Mark. 8 27–29; Matt. 16 13–20; Luke 9 18–21. See also Mark. 10 35ff.

[115] Matt. 12 46ff.

[116] Luke 18 9–15; Matt. 11 17–19; 21 31–32.

[117] Matt. 11 25 and Luke 10 21.

[118] Mark. 9 42; Matt. 10 42; 18 6, 10, 14; 21 16; Luke 17 2; 21 16.

[119] Mark. 12 38–40; Luke 20 45–47.

done to catch the notice of men; they make their phylacteries broad, they wear large tassels, they are fond of the best places at banquets and the front seats in the synagogues; they like to be saluted in the market places and to be called 'rabbi' by men."[120] Whatever may be said about the genuineness of the remainder of the chapter these words ring true to the general character of Jesus as an 'Am Ha-aretz.

It is sometimes maintained that Jesus sought to break down the barrier that separated the Pharisees from the 'amme ha-aretz. It is more in accord with the evidence that he sought to overthrow the whole system of religion for which Pharisaism stood. The righteousness which he preached was supposed to have been of a higher type than that of the Pharisees. In his interpretations of the Torah, he stressed the spiritual essence underlying the ritual commands, which, according to the Gospels, the authoritative interpreters of the Torah had failed to do. While they clung to the externals of the Law, he chose to fathom its inner depths. In reality he was not as far removed from at least some of his opponents in his emphasis on inwardness as he and his disciples may have supposed.

The fine traits of spirituality which he exhibits are characteristic of the men who during Maccabean times emerge as the *Kehal Ḥasidim*, defending with their lives their ancient traditions and piety, and returning to their peaceful life as soon as the danger that threatened their faith was over. They continue to figure no longer as a *Kahal* but as individuals until the time of the Bar Cochba revolt, when the term *ḥasid* began to be used extensively by the rabbis for any "law abiding man who conscientiously practices the moral duties."[121]

As their name indicates they conducted themselves in accordance with the principle of *Ḥesed*, mercy. Dr. Adolph Büchler writes: "The records inform us of their love of God as the guiding principle of their actions, their humility, their active love and kindness to their neighbors as the determining features of their

[120] Matt. 23 4ff., cf. vss. 2–3. See also Luke 11 39ff.

[121] A. Büchler, *Some Types of Jewish Palestinian Piety*, p. 41.

character, their attachment to God and their close relation with Him expressed in their general piety, their devout prayer, their humble interpretation of their illness as a cleansing of sin, their over-great fear of unknown transgression, and the frequent atonement for such by sacrifices."[122] Dr. Büchler points to a tendency among the Ḥasidim to minimize sacrifice, expressed in the Proverb 16 6: "By mercy and truth (true loving kindness בחסד ואמת) iniquity is expiated (atoned for, יכפר), and by the fear of the Lord men depart from evil."

Though the Ḥasidim had much in common with the Essenes, we cannot find sufficient warrant for identifying the two. While some of them abstained from marriage we hear of others who led a normal family life, in homes of their own, and pursued various occupations. As pictured in the book of Daniel, in parts of Enoch, in the Psalms of Solomon and in the Talmudic sources, their piety was believed to endow them with the gift of prophecy. Rabbi Pinḥas b. Yair, a ḥasid of the 2nd century, presents the following steps of ḥasidic piety: "Care (זריזות) leads to cleanness (נקיות), cleanness to purity (טהרה), purity to [separateness (פרישות) and separateness to] holiness; holiness to humility; humility to fear of sin; fear of sin to piety (חסידות); and piety to the Holy Spirit."[123] The gift of prophecy expressed itself in the ecstatic visions familiar to us in Daniel, Enoch and other apocalyptic writings, in mystic speculations about angels, Heaven and Hell, the Judgment, the Kingdom of God, the advent of the Messiah, the Resurrection and Olam Habba.

[122] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

[123] *Abod. Zara* 20b רבי פנחס בן יאיר אומר זריזות מביאה לידי נקיות. נקיות מביאה לידי טהרה. טהרה מביאה לידי קדושה. קדושה מביאה לידי ענוה. ענוה מביאה לידי יראת חטא. יראת חטא מביאה לידי חסידות. חסידות מביאה לידי רוח הקדש. רוח הקדש מביאה לידי תחית המתים. תחית המתים מביאה לידי אליהו ז"ל. *Jer. Shek.* III, 3; *Jer. Sab.* 1: 3; *Cant. R.L.* 1–9; *Mid. Prov.* 15, 32, 41a. *Sota* IX end, where the editions include also: וטהרה מביאה לידי קדושה. ופרישות מביאה לידי פרישות. The version in *Yalkut Shimoni* to Deut 23 10 adds: תורה מביאה [לידי זהירות, זהירות מביאה לידי זריזות. For a discussion of this passage see Büchler, *op. cit.* pp. 42 ff.

The Ḥasidim were distinguished by their high moral attainments, by their love of their fellowmen, and by their gentleness and patience. Not to reward evil with evil was one of their tenets. Both God and man they sought to serve with joy. They engaged in works of charity and of healing. Some of them gained fame as miracle workers. Various striking legends are current about Onias or Ḥoni the Circle Drawer, his grandsons Abba Ḥilkiah and Ḥanan, and about R. Ḥanina ben Dosa and R. Pinḥas b. Yair. People of all classes turned to them for aid. Even men like Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai and Rabban Gamaliel asked for their prayers. They were particularly sought in times of public distress. It is reported of Ḥanan, the grandson of Onias, that when rain was needed, the rabbis would send school children to him, who would pull him by the coat tails, calling: "Abba give us rain." Whereupon the saint prayed: "Lord of the world, for the sake of these little ones who cannot distinguish between the *Abba* (Father) who giveth rain and the *abba* (father) who can only ask without being able to produce rain, answer Thou my prayer."[124]

While some Ḥasidim, like Hillel, Ḥanina b. Dosa, R. Yeshobeb, Ben 'Azzai, etc. were Pharisees (חסיד פרוש), others, as we noted above, were not. Neither Onias nor his grandsons seem to have belonged to the Pharisaic ranks.[125]

His emphasis on faith, prayer and forgiveness, on love even for the enemy, and on returning good for evil, places Jesus in the company of the Ḥasidim who stood outside of Pharisaism. Like them he went in his Haggadic preaching beyond the letter of the Law to its innermost spirit. Like them too he claimed the possession of the Holy Spirit and manifested it in his ministry of healing and of prayer.

[124] *Ta'an,* 23b. Cf. Mark. 10 18 "Why call me good?"

[125] Onias is referred to as מגים דעתו כלפי מעלה and was threatened by Simeon b. Shetaḥ, the Pharisaic leader, with excommunication, *Ber.* 19a; *Ta'an.* 19a. Josephus refers to this saintly soul in his *Antiquities* XIV, II, 1. He died the death of a martyr for refusing to pray against the Sadducees. Abba Ḥilkiah, too, seems to have stood at a distance from the Pharisees.

F

THE ORIGINALITY OF JESUS' ETHICAL TEACHING

E. F. SCOTT
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

It has always been known that the teaching of Jesus had many points of contact with contemporary Judaism, but the full significance of this agreement was never suspected until recent years. We are now aware that those mysterious forecasts of the future which were formerly ascribed to Jesus' supernatural knowledge had their origin in Jewish apocalyptic. The Rabbinical literature has been carefully examined, and has yielded a great mass of parallels to the Gospel sayings. In view of the evidence now collected in such monumental works as Moore's *Judaism* and the *Commentary* of Strack and Billerbeck the whole question of the originality of Jesus has been forced on us in an acute form. There seems to be good ground for the emphatic statement of Klausner: "Throughout the Gospels there is not one item of ethical teaching which cannot be parallelled either in the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, or the Talmudic and Midrashic literature of the period near to Jesus."

A statement of this kind needs to be qualified by the reflection that the Jewish parallels are mostly of uncertain date. We must think twice before assuming that Jesus borrowed from teachers who lived some centuries after his time. But not a few of the crucial analogies can be confidently traced back at least to the Gospel period, and when we bear in mind the conservatism of Jewish tradition it is more than likely that the later maxims were based on earlier ones. Judaism, we may be practically certain,

did not borrow from Christianity, and when a Jewish saying, whatever may be its date, is closely similar to one in the Gospels, the presumption is that something like it was known to Jesus.

A more serious reservation must be made to Klausner's statement. Far the greater number of parallels are superficial, affecting the forms of thought more than the thought itself. Teachers who belong to a given age and culture are bound, however they differ from each other, to use the same terms of expression, the same general ideas. It may be granted that Jesus, like the Rabbis, taught in Parables, and drew the imagery for them from the usual sources. His sayings are cast in the approved mould, and deal with topics often discussed in the synagogue. These resemblances can be so piled up as to make a convincing case for dependence, but they prove little more than that Jesus lived in Palestine in the first century. It would be possible to do for *Hamlet*, on an even larger scale, what Strack and Billerbeck have done for the Gospel of Matthew. The construction of the play, the scenes in detail, every line and phrase, could be illustrated from other writings of the time. It would seem to be demonstrated that Shakespeare had done nothing but select and compile. But we all would recognise that the diligence of the commentator had been wasted. Shakespeare, to be sure, wrote like an Elizabethan Englishman, because he happened to be one, but his great tragedy cannot be explained as a product of his age. It is more truly akin to the *Agamemnon* and the *Faust* than to any contemporary work.

Nothing, indeed, can be more futile than to call in question the originality of Jesus. That he contributed something new is no illusion, due to our ignorance of his sources, but is the most patent fact of history. A movement which changed the whole direction of the world's life was manifestly new. It sprang out of Judaism, but its difference is at once apparent from two indubitable facts. On the one hand, the Jewish leaders were from the first opposed to Jesus. Their hostility was due to no passing misunderstanding, for it continued and grew ever more bitter after his death. Judaism was the most tolerant of all religions, and entertained a wide variety of sects within its borders. But

the teaching of Jesus was always felt to be subversive. The claim that it only continued the traditions of Judaism was never put forward till our own time. Again, Judaism has followed its own path of development, quite regardless of the work of Jesus. It is argued by those who would derive his whole message from Jewish sources that at most he only carried the old religion to its logical issue. The expansion of the national cult into a universal one was bound to come, and it was only a matter of accident that the final step was taken by Jesus. But such a position cannot be maintained, in face of the historical facts. It was not Jesus but the Pharisees who represented the true line of Jewish development. The type of religion which they brought to perfection was that to which Judaism had always been moving and in which it finally came to rest. The work of Jesus was not the natural outcome of Judaism but a new departure.

That Jesus was original cannot be doubted, but what was the nature of his originality? This is the real question, which the modern enquiry has placed in a clearer light and enabled us, in some measure, to answer. There is a grave confusion in most people's minds as to what constitutes originality in the sphere of morals and religion. More especially in our own time we have been dazzled by the triumphs of scientific discovery, and assume, more or less consciously, that all original thinking must conform to this type. Newton, Darwin, Pasteur were obviously original. They definitely enlarged our field of knowledge; they brought to light principles of nature which no one had guessed before. So we take for granted that if Jesus was original he also must have contributed certain ideas which were specifically new. For an ethical teacher, however, this was impossible. From the beginning men had been concerned with the great moral questions. The true answers had been forced on them by all the experiences of life and by the very conditions of man's being. Their judgments had indeed been warped by custom and tradition and strange beliefs, but there has been no religion outside of mere savagery in which the principles of right living were not in some degree recognised. In Judaism they had been discerned with marvellous insight by

a long succession of great thinkers, and a noble and comprehensive moral code had been built up, on the basis of the ten commandments. Jesus therefore had all his materials ready to his hand. It is the very proof of his originality that he was content to work with them as they were. The temptation of inferior moralists, as of second-rate poets and artists, is to despise what lies before them and strain after novelty and paradox. These cheap substitutes for originality are painfully familiar to us in our own day. Jesus did not resort to them. He perceived that everything was given in those truths which men knew already. Over all his teaching might be written the great text, "Say not, who will ascend into heaven? who will go down into the deeps? for the word is very near thee, in thy heart and in thy mouth." So he took over the traditional ethic, and yet in doing so transformed it into something new. (1) In the first place he selected from the huge amorphous mass of the teaching those elements which he deemed vital. The Law as understood by the Pharisees was cleared of all irrelevant side-issues and reduced to its few controlling principles. (2) Again, while adopting the current maxims, sometimes in identical words, he gave them a different emphasis. He threw the weight on inward motive instead of outward prescription. He changed the order of the moral demands, assigning the highest place to some which had hitherto been neglected. (3) Once more, not only did he single out the cardinal principles but he grasped them in their ultimate bearings. Obedience to God became for him fellowship with God, inward harmony of our own will with the divine will. He took up the old command to love one's neighbour, and showed that it implied love to all men, exercised without reserve. So in all his teaching he aims at the fulfilment, the larger, deeper interpretation of what was given in the Law.

In these ways, then, Jesus changed the character of the traditional ethic, and the result is sometimes described as a revision or adaptation. His message, we are told, was in no sense a new gospel, but only a re-statement of the Rabbinical teaching. This, however, is to mistake the whole purpose of his work. He was not concerned with Jewish morality but with morality itself. No

doubt he availed himself of the Rabbinical system,—the only one known to him,—and his teaching everywhere preserves the colour and savour of that Jewish ethic from which it was distilled. But his aim was to get down, beneath all that was accidental, to what was ultimate and permanent in the moral law. It is hardly too much to say that if he had been born in a different environment, say in Greece, he would still have arrived at an ethic substantially the same as that which we find in the Gospels. Certainly he would have expressed himself in different language. He would have thought by different categories. It would have been an easy matter to explain his teaching as nothing new, but a mere revision of the current Platonism or Stoicism. Yet in all essentials it would have been the Gospel teaching. Under the forms provided by Greek thought it would have set itself, as it actually does, to establish the vital principles of the moral life.

There is another side, however, from which the originality of Jesus has to be considered. The great end of all ethical thinking is not knowledge but action. Probably there is no moral code which would not, if it were fully carried into practice, produce a noble type of character. We talk grandly about the need for new ethical formulations, but what men we should all be to-day if we had only *acted* on the simple maxims of our copy-books! There is no difficulty about the knowledge; but how is it to be changed into performance? That is the real problem which confronts every religion and ethical system. It is not by the sentiments he utters that we must test the originality of a religious teacher, but by his power of moving men to action. One thinks of Augustine, St. Francis, Luther, Wesley, — men who have revolutionised the life of the church. They occupy a place by themselves as creative men, and yet their ideas were all borrowed. There have been hundreds of quite secondary writers and preachers who have said more original things than those great men who changed the course of history. What did their newness consist in? Not so much in their ideas as in the momentum they gave to these ideas, the force with which they impressed their own mind on others. "My peculiar gift," Napoleon once said, "is to

electrify men." That is the highest, and when all is said, the supremely original gift. In this direction we must look for the new element in the work of Jesus.

How, then, are we to explain the dynamic quality in his message? To this question no final answer is possible, but it is not difficult to perceive some of the reasons why his word was quick and powerful. (1) For one thing it had behind it a compelling motive in the hope for the Kingdom of God. In Jewish apocalyptic the hope was bound up with fantastic millennarian ideas, and served as the lever for ardent patriotic movements. Jesus thought of the Kingdom as the new spiritual order which would shortly be established. He associated his call to righteousness with a splendid vision of that coming age, when God's will would be done on earth as in heaven. In this manner he made his demands vivid and concrete, and brought home to men their infinite importance. He changed a grudging submission to the moral law into a high enthusiasm. In one form or another the hope for the Kingdom has always been the driving power behind the Christian message. However it is conceived it stands for a supreme goal which may be attained through moral endeavour.

(2) Again, the power of Jesus' teaching was due to his intense realisation of the things he taught. The truths might themselves be old, but no one before him had grasped them with such absolute conviction. He made men feel, as they listened to him, that these were no mere theories or surmises but the great realities. This is surely the true answer to the debated question whether Jesus was original in his conception of God as Father. It has been proved, by the usual method of parallels, that the name "Father" was frequently applied to God in contemporary Judaism, and that Jesus, therefore, contributed nothing new. But the real point is that he not only called God "Father" but knew him as the Father. What had hitherto been a pious formula summed up for him all that was deepest and most certain in his experience of God. He so communicated his faith to others that they were wrought to a new attitude of soul, and could feel as he did that God was their Father. It is in this sense that all his teaching.

wherever we examine it, was a *revelation*. For revelation, in the highest meaning of the term, does not consist in the divulging of some mystery, never before suspected. The great revelations come to every man when things which he has heard of a thousand times,—love, sorrow, death,—are suddenly *realised*. What Jesus brought to men was not something occult and new but this realisation of eternal truths.

(3) Once more, he so identified himself with his teaching that obedience to it became a matter of personal loyalty. There are few who can follow an abstract ideal; all are capable of devotion to a person. The Word must become flesh, the cause must embody itself in the hero or martyr, before it can work with power. It was the supreme achievement of Jesus that he exemplified in himself all that he taught. He inspired a passionate loyalty which could not but express itself in the doing of his commandments. We are sometimes told that the conception of him which exists to-day in the minds of Christian men has little to do with the historical figure. Into his thought of Jesus each believer projects his own deepest convictions and aspirations. He imagines a character endowed with all divine excellences and reads it into the Gospel history. But even if this be so we can recognise no less clearly what Jesus actually accomplished. He gave a living centre to which all ideals could henceforth attach themselves. He made it possible for men to identify the moral law with a personal leader who evokes their love and confidence. It was by no accident or perversion that Christianity became a mystical religion, in which Jesus himself was the object of faith. The Teacher made himself one with the teaching, and here we must discover the ultimate secret of his originality and power.

MARK'S TRANSITIONS AND THE TRANSLATION HYPOTHESIS

MILLAR BURROWS
BROWN UNIVERSITY

THAT the Greek of Mark's gospel has a strong Aramaic flavor is generally recognized. Very few scholars, however, are convinced that the gospel as a whole has been translated from an Aramaic original. Jesus spoke Aramaic. The stories about him were first told in Aramaic, and in the course of oral transmission in that language they may have assumed a more or less stereotyped form. It is easy to imagine, therefore, that when they came to be written in Greek they would still retain some of the idioms of the established tradition.

Before we accept such an explanation, however, there is one consideration which must give us pause. The translator of a written document may be expected to adhere more or less closely to his original and reproduce many of its characteristic idioms, but oral translation cannot be quite so literal. Suppose, for example,—adopting for the moment a questionable interpretation of the familiar testimony of Papias—that Peter preached in his native tongue, and Mark interpreted his sermons to Greek-speaking congregations. Peter's preaching would undoubtedly be more or less alike in different cities. A speaker who addresses many audiences on the same theme almost inevitably develops a fixed form of expression. Mark's Greek *targum* also would naturally settle into regular grooves. But how closely would Mark's Greek adhere to Peter's Aramaic? A speaker cannot pause after every word; the interpreter must translate by sentences or paragraphs rather than by words or phrases. His rendering must be not so much a trans-

lation as a paraphrase, like those which we find in many bilingual inscriptions.

Now when we postulate a more complicated theory of oral transmission, whether by preaching or by catechetical instruction or by both, the same consideration holds good. A Greek oral tradition would retain little trace of the Aramaic idiom. Literary composition in Greek on the basis of an oral Aramaic tradition would be equally free from Semitisms. The frequent Aramaisms in Mark point plainly to the conclusion that the evangelist's material had been reduced to writing in Aramaic before it was used in a Greek gospel.

There remains the possibility that the stories and sayings had been written and translated separately, or in various combinations, but were edited and arranged in the form of our gospel by a Greek writer. Here, fortunately, we are not limited to general and subjective considerations. The theory can be tested objectively. If Mark's Aramaisms only reflect the form in which his material came to him, then they will be confined to the stories and sayings themselves; they will not appear in the transitional sentences with which he links his materials together in a consecutive narrative and fits them into his outline. An author or editor writing in Greek might retain unidiomatic expressions in his sources which were the result of translation, but he would hardly carry them over into passages which he composed himself. Certainly our evangelist was not the type of writer to assimilate his own style artfully to that of his sources, even if he had any motive for so doing. An examination of Mark's transitions, therefore, will show us whether or not the book is a Greek compilation of materials originally composed in Aramaic.

Unfortunately it is impossible to know just what were the original divisions and just what sentences or parts of sentences are to be regarded as editorial links. We cannot always tell what was a separate item of the tradition or how many items may have been already combined in the material as it came into the evangelist's hands. The exponents of *Formgeschichte* as applied to the Synoptic Gospels would have us believe that the whole framework in which

Mark presents the life of Jesus, including practically all indications of time, place, and circumstance, are his own creation, only the disconnected elements having been derived from tradition. If we could accept this analysis as established, our task would be relatively simple, but there are grave objections to such a confident assumption. I cannot here attempt a critical investigation of this fundamental problem, nor can I consider the hypothesis of an earlier edition of Mark. As a matter of expediency it seems best to take as the basis of the present inquiry the sections into which the gospel is divided in the *Harmony* of Burton and Goodspeed. Huck's *Synopse* divides somewhat differently in a few instances, and the commentaries on Mark exhibit slightly varying outlines, but the differences are neither numerous nor important.

The test I propose is a simple one—too simple, doubtless, to do justice to the problem, yet not without some significance. The question of mistranslation need not detain us, nor is it necessary to ask whether any particular expression is or is not a genuine Aramaism. Certainly we need not exert ourselves to ferret out hitherto undetected traces of Aramaic influence. For our purpose it will be sufficient to see whether the transitional sentences embody any expressions which are generally recognized as Aramaisms when they occur in the sayings of Jesus and in the narratives concerning him. If these sentences are free from such expressions, we may reasonably hold that the gospel was written in Greek; if we find acknowledged Aramaisms in transitional passages, the translation hypothesis will have one more argument in its favor.

Setting aside the later conclusion of the gospel, we note that there are eighty-three sections in Mark as it is divided by Burton and Goodspeed. Examination of the sentences with which these sections begin shows at once that in no case do we have what could be called elegant Greek. No section of the original book is introduced by such a classical idiom as Ο μεν ουν κυριος, which we find in the unauthentic conclusion (16 19). But this is not surprising: we knew to begin with that the gospel was not written by an academic rhetorician.

Similarly we can infer nothing from locutions which, though

familiar as characteristic Semitic idioms, may also be attributed to the *Koine* dialect, to the unpolished, colloquial style of the writer, or to his individual idiosyncrasies. For example, seventy-four of the eighty-three opening sentences begin with *και*, five use *δε*, and one begins with *αλλα*. All of these might represent the simple ו, but the use of this conjunction at the head of nearly every sentence is more Hebrew than Aramaic. Of the remaining three sentences one is the title (1 1), one begins with the verb without any conjunction (9 38, *v. i.*), and the other opens with the Old Testament phrase, "In those days" (8 1).

Other expressions which are Hebrew rather than Aramaic, and which may be due to the influence of the Septuagint, occur in a few opening sentences. The introductory *και εγενετο* (ויהי) followed by an expression of time, common in the Septuagint and in Luke, appears only three times in Mark, two of the instances being in transitional sentences (1 9; 2 23). In one of these Westcott and Hort enclose the words *και εγενετο* in brackets: without them the verse begins, like 8 1, *Εν εκειναις ταις ημεραις* (בימים ההם).

In 7 24 and 10 1 the aorist participle *αναστας* may represent still another idiom familiar in Old Testament Hebrew (ויקם); the same word in 1 35, however, probably refers literally to arising from bed in the morning.

The words *και ελεγεν* (ויאמר) begin three of the sections (4 21, 26, 30; also frequently within sections). More in accord with Aramaic usage is the asyndeton of 9 38, *Εφη αυτῳ ο Ιωανης*, which recalls the characteristic אמר לה, familiar to every reader of Aramaic.

In four of his opening sentences Mark uses the historical present, *λεγει* (4 13, 35; 8 1; 13 1, and often within sections). This construction has often been noted as characteristic of his style. With other verbs it appears in twenty of the transitional verses (1 21, 40; 3 13, 19, 31; 6 1, 30; 7 1; 8 22; 9 2; 10 1, 35, 46; 11 1, 15, 27; 12 13, 18; 14 32; 15 21). If within the stories Mark's historical present represents the idiomatic use of the Aramaic present participle, it may also reflect the same idiom in the introductory sentences.

None of these facts can be regarded as proving that Mark's transitions, like his materials, were composed in Aramaic. More

impressive is the expression εξηλθεν και απηλθεν in 1 35. The words και απηλθεν are bracketed by Westcott and Hort; they look like a conflation, but their omission in many manuscripts may be due to their apparent redundancy. Wellhausen points out (*Einleitung*, p. 14) that they correspond to the Aramaic נפק ואזל, where the distinction between the two verbs is more evident than it is in the Greek. Only the fact that the text is somewhat in doubt keeps this from being a conclusive bit of evidence.

Other Aramaisms occur in transitional sentences where the text is not questioned. They have all been pointed out repeatedly by such scholars as Wellhausen, Dalman, Torrey, Allen, and Burney.

1) The repetition of the possessive pronoun in 3 31, "his mother and his brothers," makes awkward Greek, but in Aramaic the suffix would have to be attached to both nouns.

2) Mark's characteristic use of ειναι with the present participle of the principle verb, reproducing literally the Aramaic idiom which he elsewhere renders with the historical present, appears in 2 18, "And John's disciples and the Pharisees were fasting" (meaning that they practised fasting, not necessarily that they were actually fasting at that moment). It also appears in 10 32, "they were on the way going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going before them."

3) Another peculiarly Aramaic idiom is the indefinite use of the verb in the third person plural active, without any expressed subject or antecedent, often taking the place of a passive verb. This we find in four of the transitional verses. In 8 22 the subject of the clause, "they bring to him a blind man," is not the same as that of the immediately preceding clause, "And they come unto Bethsaida;" it means simply, "A blind man is brought to him." In like manner the subject is unexpressed and indefinite in 10 13, "they were bringing unto him little children;" 12 13, "they send unto him certain of the Pharisees and Herodians;" and 14 53, "they led Jesus away" (cp. verse 51, "they lay hold on him"—the last "they" before this refers to the disciples, v. 50). Again we have awkward Greek but excellent Aramaic.

4) The use of αποκριθεις before ελεγεν is another form of speech

characteristic of the tongue in which the gospel was first proclaimed. It is familiar in Hebrew also. As a child I used to marvel at the statements in the gospels that Jesus "answered" when no one had said anything. They seemed to me a manifest proof of his ability to read men's thoughts. In Hebrew and Aramaic, however, the expression "answered and said" does not necessarily imply a response to a previous utterance. The *locus classicus* is Dan 4 27 (4 30 in the English versions), where Nebuchadnezzar, by himself on the housetop, "spake (*literally*, answered) and said "Is not this great Babylon. . . ?" In Mark 12 35 a distinct section has just been concluded, and a new one commences with the words, "And Jesus answered and said, as he taught in the temple. . ."

5) Equally unmistakable is an Aramaism which occurs in the opening sentences of five of Mark's sections, as well as elsewhere in the gospel, the unemphatic, if not almost meaningless, use of the verb "begin." In 4 1 and 8 31 Jesus "began to teach;" in 12 1 he "began to speak;" in 11 15 he "began to cast out them that sold and them that bought in the temple;" in 8 11 the Pharisees "began to question with him." There can be no doubt that in these passages, as in those like them within the sections, we have a reflection of the well-known Aramaic usage (שרי).

Thus there are indubitable Aramaisms in the opening verses of fourteen of the eighty-three sections and noteworthy, though less conclusive, indications of Semitic influence in a large proportion of the others. The proportion of words and phrases betraying the original language would hardly be larger in any translation, be it ever so literal. Statistical comparisons are irrelevant, because in any case the alien idiom will appear only occasionally.

To be sure, in estimating the significance of these facts we must remember not only that Burton and Goodspeed's divisions are not necessarily those of the material as it lay before the evangelist, but also that there is sometimes really little or no transition from one section to another. The opening verses of many sections are integral parts of the stories themselves; apparently the separate items have been merely placed together without any bridge-passage between them. In such cases Aramaisms prove no more

in the opening sentences than in the body of the story. Again, the editorial link may sometimes consist of a single clause or phrase. In 12 35, for example, the evangelist may have inserted simply the words, "teaching in the temple," to bind the section to what precedes it. If so, the expression "answered and said" belongs to the source and not to the editorial link. About half of our fourteen instances of indubitable Aramaisms in transitional verses seem to be open to this objection, but how far it actually applies to any of them I can see no way to determine.

On the other hand, it is equally possible that there are editorial passages within the sections of Burton and Goodspeed. If these could be detected and isolated, we might find convincing evidence of Aramaic influence in them also. Furthermore, while the conclusions of those scholars who have attempted to trace the *Formgeschichte* of the gospel materials could not afford a firm basis for our investigation, we may remark that their acceptance would have compelled us to regard as editorial a great many verses containing Aramaic idioms which we have not taken into account because they were not the opening verses of sections in the *Harmony*.

Mathematical certainty in particular instances, and therefore in the whole matter, is apparently unattainable at present. One thing, however, seems clear: *we cannot distinguish the evangelist's own writing from his sources by the criterion of Aramaic coloring.* We do not find bridge-passages in idiomatic Greek connecting sections of translation Greek. So far as its Aramaisms are concerned, the gospel of Mark appears to be a unit. Whatever inference, therefore, may be drawn from the Aramaisms found in any part of the book must be predicated of the gospel as a whole. If in sayings and stories derived from the primitive tradition the Aramaic idioms are the result of translation, we have no right to ascribe the same idioms in transitional passages to any other cause.

THE SCRIPTURE BASIS OF "ON THE THIRD DAY"

SELBY VERNON McCASLAND
GOUCHER COLLEGE

I

THE problem here raised for investigation is the scripture basis of the belief in the early church that the resurrection of Jesus occurred on the third day. The earliest reference to the three days feature of the resurrection narrative is the statement of Paul, "he hath been raised the third day according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. 15 4). In each of the four gospels the resurrection is related to have taken place on Sunday, i. e., on the third day, but in spite of their agreeing on the day of the resurrection the gospels reflect the existence of traditions that do not harmonize with "on the third day."

The Gospel of Mark relates that when the women came to the tomb "very early on the first day of the week," which was the third day, a young man informed them that Jesus had risen. The time of the visit was "when the sun had risen" (16 2). That is the view of the author of the gospel, but incidentally he reveals further data: Jesus three times foretells his resurrection "after three days" (8 31; 9 31; 10 34); he is accused of having said that he could rebuild the temple "in three days" (14 58); and on the cross he is taunted with being the one who said he could "destroy the temple and rebuild it in three days" (15 30). So while the author of Mark is definite in saying the resurrection took place on the first day of the week, i. e., the third day, he presents other material that is not entirely in harmony with that view.

In the Gospel of Matthew it is stated that the women came to the tomb "early on the first day of the week" (28 1); Matthew takes over the three prophecies of the resurrection from Mark but corrects "after three days" to "on the third day" (16 21; 17 23; 20 19); the accusation recorded by Mark, "in three days," is taken over without change (26 61); the taunt on the cross, "in three days," is left unchanged (27 40); he introduces a statement of the Jews to Pilate, "after three days" (27 63); and also the reference to Jonah "so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (12 40). In addition to his revision of Mark, therefore, Matthew provides the entirely new datum about Jonah.

Luke states that the women went to the tomb "very early on the first day of the week" (24 1); he changes Mark's first and third cases of "after three days" to "on the third day" (9 22; 18 33), and drops out the second entirely (9 44); either he adds an entirely new example of "on the third day" in the post-resurrection statement of Jesus, or, what is possible, this is the reappearance in a different form of the Markan passage which he earlier omitted (24 46); since he has a different passion source, the accusation and taunt do not appear; and what may be still another version of the omitted Markan saying is the statement of the angel to the women that Jesus while in Galilee had foretold his resurrection "on the third day" (24 7). Another example of Luke's view is the statement of Peter to Cornelius that God had raised Jesus from the dead "on the third day" (Acts 10 40), providing therefore six examples of the uniform usage of the third evangelist.

In the Gospel of John, the visit of Mary to the grave was "on the first day of the week while it was yet dark" (20 1); and the only additional evidence on the question is the statement of Jesus, "destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it" (2 19). However, a note of interest relative to the length of time required for the spirit of the dead to depart from the body is Martha's statement about her brother, "indeed he decays, for it is the fourth day" (11 39). John is consistent, as was Luke, in holding that Jesus rose from the dead on the third day.

The second century Gospel of Peter, which is the first writing

to give a description of the actual rising of Jesus, relates, "Now in the night whereon the Lord's Day dawned, as the soldiers were keeping guard two by two in every watch, there came a great sound in the heaven, etc."[1] The apostolic fathers agree in placing the resurrection on the first day of the week, though there is no specific mention of the third day.[2]

The earliest extra-canonical actual mention of the three days is found in the Apology of Aristides, "Ipse ab Iudaeis crucifixus est, et mortuus et sepultus est, et dicunt post tres dies eum resurrexisse et ad caelos ascendisse."[3] Its next appearance is in Justin, "for the Lord hung on the tree until almost evening and at eventide they buried him; then on the third day he arose."[4]

II

While it is clear that by the time the early literature reached its final form it was uniformly recognized that the resurrection took place on the third day, nevertheless,there remain indications of other traditions which existed at one time side by side with the third day and were eventually displaced by it.

(1) There is considerable evidence of a tradition that the resurrection occurred on the same day as the crucifixion. Matthew tells of the saints that were raised on that day, "and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many" (27 52—53). This passage shows the confusion caused by the union of the one-day tradition with that of the third day, so that the saints who were raised were compelled to remain unsheltered in or about the tomb from Friday until Sunday before Jesus rose from the dead, that they might go with him into the city. The Gospel of Peter also reflects this tradition in its description of the ascension from the cross.[5]

[1] IX, 35. M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament* (1924), p. 92.
[2] *Didaché* xiv; Ignatius, *Mag.* ix; Barnabus, xv, 8—9, etc.
[3] 15, 2, Goodspeed ed. p. 19.
[4] *Dialogue* 97; and 100.
[5] X, 41 and XIII, 56; M. R. James, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

Still stronger evidence of this same tradition is the quartodeciman practice of the second century of celebrating both the death and resurrection on the same day, Nisan fourteenth.[6]

(2) A tradition that the resurrection was after three days and three nights is shown by Matthew's reference to Jonah (12 30), and also in the Syriac *Didascalia*.

(3) Furthermore, there is evidence of a tradition that the resurrection occurred after the feast of Unleavened Bread. The last fragment of the Gospel of Peter breaks off with the statement that it was the last day of Unleavened Bread, and the feast was at an end, when the disciples in sorrow were returning home to their nets. The fragment no doubt at one time at this point contained an account of the Lord's appearance to the disciples, almost ten days from the crucifixion.[7] Evidence to the same effect may be the reference in Acts to the forty days in which Jesus taught the disciples before the ascension (1 3), and the remark of Tertullian, "But he spent forty days with some of his disciples down in Galilee."[8]

That some of the early Christians were embarrassed by these contradictions in the traditions about the resurrection is shown by the effort of the third century Syriac *Didascalia* to account for the three days and three nights: "those hours during which our Lord hung on the cross were reckoned as one day. After that moreover was a darkness of three hours and it was reckoned as one night, and from the ninth hour to the evening the three hours were one day; and after that the night of the Sabbath suffering.... And again the day of the Sabbath in which our Lord slept and then rose."[9]

[6] Eus., *H. E.*, V, xxiii, 1—2.

[7] XIV, 59—60. Their sorrow indicates that Jesus had not yet risen; or, at least, that they did not know of it.

[8] *Apology* 21. Cf. B. W. Bacon, *AJT* XV, 1911, pp. 372—403; also G. Bertram, *Festgabe für Deissmann*, 1926, pp. 187ff., "Die Himmelfahrt Jesu vom Kreuz aus und der Glaube an seine Auferstehung."

[9] *Texte und Untersuchungen*, NF. 10, Heft 2, p. 105ff.

III

This confusion in the early tradition about the day of the resurrection raises the question as to the origin of the third day view which finally prevailed. The evangelists themselves indicate that Jesus had predicted his resurrection, but the "after three days" of Mark and "three days and three nights" of Matthew do not agree with that view; for, if Jesus predicted his resurrection on the third day, in three days, after three days, and after three days and three nights, as is variously reported, the lack of agreement would have been confusing to the early disciples who saw the visions of their risen Lord. This view is fraught with extreme difficulty also when one faces the problem of the messianic consciousness of Jesus; for it is not only a problem how or why Jesus predicted his resurrection at some definite time near the third day but a real question whether he predicted his resurrection at all. The Gospel of Mark excludes the view that "on the third day" was due to an appearance of Jesus to the disciples on that day by the remark that the women who had seen him told no one and by the clear evidence that the first visions were in Galilee (14 28; 16 7); so it was impossible for the disciples who were on that day still in Jerusalem to see Jesus in Galilee on that same day. Whatever else may be said about the messianic consciousness of Jesus it is clear that, as time passed after his death, in the thinking of the disciples the views of Jesus about himself were heightened in various ways. The prophecies of his resurrection are a case in point; for after the vision experiences the disciples saw many things that Jesus had said in a different light. An example of this is the saying about building the temple again in three days. Mark, followed by Matthew, gives this as part of the false testimony against Jesus before the Sanhedrin; Luke, strangely, does not have any reference to this saying at all; but it appears again in John, and, this time, not as false testimony against Jesus, but as one of the great sayings predicting his resurrection, although it was not understood until the disciples looked back upon it in the light of the vision experiences (John 2 18–22). If we could penetrate back far enough into the origin of the early traditions

many of them would probably exhibit a development similar to this saying about the temple. It is not clear therefore that "on the third day" is to be attributed either to the specific prediction of Jesus or to his appearance to the disciples on that day.

And looking further, we note that some of the New Testament writers do not attribute "on the third day" to either of the above causes but derive it from scripture. Paul, the earliest writer, makes his view clear when he says "he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures" (1 Cor. 15 4); Luke reports that Jesus opened their minds, that they might understand the scriptures in which it was written that "the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day, etc." (24 46); and John shows that he attributed the belief to the scriptures by saying, relative to the temple, which could be rebuilt in three days, "When therefore he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he spake this; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said" (2 22). Although attributing "on the third day" to scripture, however, neither of these writers mentions the scripture that he has in mind. To what passage, if any, did they refer?

IV

In the early preaching relative to the resurrection, psalms 16 and 110 and Isaiah 53 were so important and so much used that they are incorporated in the sermons in Acts (2 25 ff.; 2 34; 8 32); but all of these are silent about the third day, so the statements of Paul, Luke and John are not derived from them.

The only scripture used in the New Testament as a basis for the three days is the reference to Jonah, and the passage in which it is contained has an instructive history in the different sources. According to Mark, Jesus at one time on being asked for a sign replied, "no sign shall be given to this generation" (8 12). Luke and Matthew both revise this statement of Mark allowing a sign to be given and referring to Jonah as the sign. Luke revised Mark by saying, "No sign shall be given it except the sign of Jonah" (11 29); and he indicates that he refers to the preaching of Jonah which was similar to that of Jesus by adding shortly, "The men

of Nineveh shall stand up in the Judgment with this generation and condemn it because they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold a greater than Jonah is here" (11 29—32). Now Matthew gives an exact parallel to this material of Luke (16 4; 12 39—41). This agreement is to be explained by the assumption that both of them here use the Q source which itself originated the reference to the preaching of Jonah. But not satisfied with the Q usage of Jonah, Matthew revises again and this time adds the specific reference to the three days and three nights (12 40). There are therefore three stages in the history of this context; first, Jesus denies any sign whatever, according to Mark; second, reference is made to the preaching of Jonah as being similar to that of Jesus, according to Q; and third, Matthew adds the interpretation of Jonah which makes his three days and nights a prophecy of the time that Jesus is to be in the heart of the earth. The appearance of this Jonah reference in Matthew shows that it was made use of in the preaching, and it was indeed appropriate and conclusive. It is the only Old Testament scripture used in the New Testament to establish the three days motif. However, analysis of the sources as above shows that this scripture began to be used comparatively late; Paul, Mark, Q and Luke all show no evidence of knowing of it; and it appears first in Matthew. In view of its germaneness we can scarcely believe that the earlier writers knew of it but passed it over; so we conclude that this was not the passage in the mind of Paul, Luke or John, upon which belief in "on the third day" was based. And it should be noted too that the three days and three nights of the Jonah narrative do not agree with "on the third day" of the early tradition. This divergence together with the fact that the Jonah reference does not appear in the earliest tradition practically eliminates this passage as a source of "on the third day"; and in eliminating this passage we give up the most likely one in the early tradition, in fact the only one that at all approaches the requirements of the case. We are compelled to admit, if Paul and Luke and John had any definite passage in mind, which is not at all certain, that they have not left enough evidence of it to enable us to recover it at this time.

V

While it is true that no clear trace remains of any definite passage used by the earliest tradition or by Jesus in establishing "on the third day," there are nevertheless many investigators who have searched the Old Testament for passages that might have been used; out of numerous possibilities Hosea 6 1—3 has often been cited as a very likely passage; and some writers have felt quite certain that this passage was not only in the mind of the early disciples but was also in the mind of Jesus and caused him to predict his own resurrection "on the third day."[10] Now if this passage was used at all in the thinking of Jesus, or of any of those whose experiences lie back of the New Testament writings, we would normally expect some reference to it in some of those writings. The writers have obviously made great effort to find support for their views in Old Testament scriptures and it is not too much to presume that everywhere they have cited the scripture most germane to the case being considered; but none of these writers has left any reference to this passage from Hosea. Modern scholars have assumed that this scripture was important and used in the thinking of the earliest Christians, but have never (so far as I have seen) cited a case where it was used either in the New Testament or later Christian writings. Bowen has attempted to show that this scripture was used in the Jewish messianic speculation current at the time, so that it would naturally have entered into Christian thinking. On the point, however, he cites the use of this scripture in the Jonathan Targum which came into its present form not earlier than the fifth century and in the passage cited the scripture is not given a messianic interpretation but refers to a general resurrection of the dead;[11] and in this Targum the three

[10] Cf. Clayton R. Bowen, *The Resurrection in the New Testament* (1911), pp. 18—19; also Kirsopp Lake, *The Resurrection of Jesus Christ* (1907), pp. 27—33. Bowen concludes in favor of the Hosea passage; Lake thinks that no definite passage can be found which was used in the earliest tradition.

[11] Bowen, *op. cit.*, pp. 32—33; Walton's *Polyglott*, vol. III; "They shall say: Come and let us return to the worship of the Lord, for he who smote us will also heal us, and he who brought upon us destruction, will revive us.

days motif of this Hosea passage has fallen away entirely, so that aside from the late date of the source from which it comes it has slight value for the purpose for which it was cited.

Other examples of this passage in rabbinic usage from the third century on are cited by Strack-Billerbeck, which may possibly reflect interpretations current in the first century; but they refer to a general resurrection and the end of the world and make no specific reference to the Messiah or to the death of any particular person.[12] If this rabbinic interpretation was current in Jesus' day and he adopted it as his own, his teaching was not about himself and his own personal resurrection, except as a member of the race which should face these last things, but was relative to things which made up the Jewish eschatology of the time; so that if the views of the disciples with regard to the third day were derived from teaching of Jesus of this sort they transformed it after his death to make it apply to him personally and gave it a meaning which it never had when it came from him.

In the Christian tradition (so far as I have been able to discover) the first person to make actual application of the Hosea passage to the resurrection of Jesus was Tertullian. He makes use of this scripture twice. The first instance is in *Against Marcion*, IV, xliii: "It was very meet that the man who buried the Lord should thus be noticed in prophecy, and thenceforth be 'blessed;' since prophecy does not omit the (pious) office of the women who resorted before daybreak to the sepulchre with the spices which they had prepared. For of this incident it is said by Hosea: 'To seek my face they will watch till daylight, saying, Come, and let us return to the Lord: for he hath stripped, and he will heal us; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up; after two days will he revive us; on the third day we shall rise up.' "[13] One other time

He will give us life in the days of consolation which are coming, in the day of the resurrection of the dead he will resuscitate us, and we shall live before him." Cf. also, Paris *Polyglott* iv, *ad locum.*

[12] Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, I, pp. 747, 760.

[13] Cf. *ANF.*, III, pp. 421—422; *Pat. Lat.*, 2, p. 496, "Sic nec munerum

Tertullian makes the same use and application of this scripture.[14] Both times he gives a very free translation and usage of this text, so that it is doubtful whether he had the Hebrew, LXX, or an earlier Latin translation before him; and his interpretation exhibits great acumen and cleverness in the use of the prophets. In the literal meaning of the Hebrew יְשַׁחֲרֻנִנִי or LXX ὀρθριοῦσι (the root meaning in each case is "dawn," and as a verb, "to seek diligently or earnestly as at dawn") Tertullian has discovered a prophecy of the women who are said to have gone early, while it was yet dark, bearing their spices to the tomb; and in Hosea's proverbial two or three days, meaning a short time after which Israel and Judah struck down by Jahveh for their sins shall be revived, he finds the resurrection of Jesus from the dead on the third day. This scripture corresponds exactly to the requirements of "on the third day;" in fact, it fits the needs of the case so well that its absence from the New Testament and literature before the time of Tertullian is incomprehensible, in view of the scarcity of scripture basis for this very feature of the resurrection narrative, unless we assume that Tertullian himself was the first one to use it. It should be noted also, however, that this scripture satisfies the requirements of "on the third day" but not of "after three days" or "three days and three nights;" it could not have been the basis for all these predictions in the sayings of Jesus or in the thinking of the early disciples; and so it is more probable that this scripture, as well as the reference to Jonah, was an after thought, and was used as a validation of a tradition that had arisen on other grounds. And really any particular scripture would be

illorum officium praeterit, prophetia, quae ante lucem convenerunt ad sepulchrum cum odorum paratura. De hac enim per Osee: Ut quaerant, inquit, faciem meam, ante lucem vigilabunt ad me, dicentes, Eamus, et convertamur ad Dominum, quia ipse eripuit, et curabit nos; percussit, et miserebitur nostrum; sanabit nos post biduum, in die tertia resurgemus."

[14] *Against the Jews*, 13; some doubt is held of the genuineness of this book. Cf. Harnack on Tertullian in the *Ency. Brit.*, 11th ed.; also Iwan Mueller's *Handbuch*, VIII, iii, pp. 302—304; but this discussion does not affect *Against Marcion*.

under the same difficulty; it could not satisfy the demands of the various expressions of the third day tradition.

After the time of Tertullian this Hosea passage appears frequently and is used with the same interpretation. It appears twice in Cyprian[15] and twice in Lactantius[16]. Lactantius indeed finds proof of "on the third day" in a prophecy which he quotes from the Sibyl: "And after sleeping three days, he shall put an end to the fate of death; and then, releasing himself from the dead, he shall come to light, first showing to the called ones the beginning of the resurrection." These later writers in their use of Hosea are probably dependent upon Tertullian, and they also connect various other Old Testament references with the resurrection of Jesus which quite clearly were discovered by persons later than Jesus and the New Testament age in their quest for scriptural certainty.[17]

[15] *Treatises of Cyprian*, I, iv, 35; II, xxv.

[16] *Divine Institutes*, I v, xix; *Epitome*, xlvii.

[17] I am indebted to Professor B. W. Bacon for a reference to the use of this scripture in the fifth century *Altercatio Simonis Iudaei et Theophili Christiani*, written by the Gallic monk Euagrius, which was published by Harnack in 1883 in an effort to show that it is either a translation or a revision of the *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus*, attributed by Maximus Confessor in the seventh century to Ariston of Pella. But Harnack's position was so assailed that he admitted in 1893 (*Überlieferung*, pp. 93—95) that he had overstated his case. The most thorough and careful edition of this work is that of Eduard Bratke (1904) who concludes (Praefatio, x-xi): Coniecturam illam de origine Altercationis factam hodie uix Harnack ipse defenderit, sed ne id quidem contendere audeam Euagrium apologiam Aristonis legisse flosculosque ex ea excerpsisse, nam nullam uocum uel sententiarum Aristoni peculiarium certam memoriam in Altercatione reperire possum. aliorum uero scriptorum antiquorum ecclesiasticorum studio Euagrium incubuisse satis ueri simile est, inprimis ex operibus Tertulliani et Cypriani nec non ex homiliis, quae "Tractatus Origenis" uocantur, libellum suum contexuisse uidetur, etc." The literature on this problem is cited in Otto Stählin, *Geschichte der altchristlichen griechischen Literatur* (1924), p. 1283, note 3, and in Otto Bardenhewer, *Patrologie* (1910), pp. 38 and 446—447. As to the *Disputation of Jason and Papiscus* mentioned by Celsus and Origen (*Contra Celsum*, iv, 52), we do not know who wrote it or what it contained, save that some Christian writer is said to have converted a Jew by use of the scriptures.

Our conclusion is, therefore, that "on the third day" did not have its origin in some Old Testament scripture, although Paul, Luke and John refer to scripture as the basis of their tradition. It seems more probable that the tradition arose on other grounds and was then attributed to scripture, even though no particular passage was in the mind of those who did it. This was the natural procedure on the assumption of the early church that every feature of the life and work and significance of Jesus had been foretold in scripture; and the fact that a specific passage could not be found to validate a particular belief or tradition did not lead them to question that it was foretold but only incited them to a more diligent search.

Here is not the place to consider the problem of the actual origin of "on the third day" but, although we probably shall never be able to remove all questions from this early tradition, there are certain possibilities for a satisfactory approach to the investigation. It is clear, in the first place, that the belief that Jesus rose from the dead was due to visions experienced by some of the disciples soon, i. e., a few days, after his death; and, in the second place, various considerations enter into their coming to the conclusion that he rose "on the third day." Among these were probably the widely prevalent view that spirits of the dead lingered about three days near the body or the tomb before going away finally into Hades,[18] and the resurrection narratives familiar to the thought of the time which often embodied the three days motif either in the actual myth or in the celebrations.[19] In order to be a genuine resurrection according to the thought of the time the Christian narrative had to conform to these popular thought-

[18] Cf. The Apocalypse of Elias, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, NF., ii, (1899), pp. 127, 150, 163; Assumption of the Virgin, M. R. James, *Apoc. New Testament*, (1924), p. 196; John 11 39; Strack-Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 544—545; Boeklen, *Die Verwandtschaft der jüdisch-christlichen mit der parsischen Eschatologie*, (1902), pp. 27—31; Jal Dastur Cursetji Pavry, *The Zoroastrian Doctrine of a Future Life*, (1926), pp. 9—29.

[19] Hyacinth, Fraser, *Adonis, Attis and Osiris*, I, pp. 313—317; Attis, Fraser, *op. cit.*, pp. 263—276; Osiris, Fraser, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 3—23.

forms. It could not be less, and would not be much more, than three days. Still another factor in the problem was the adoption by the early church of Sunday as its Sabbath. Sunday agrees with "on the third day," for it was the third day from the crucifixion on the Friday before; but it does not agree with the tradition shown in some sources (see above) of a resurrection on the same day as the crucifixion; nor with the three days and three nights of the Jonah passage; nor with the tradition that the resurrection came after the close of the feast of Unleavened Bread. Obviously these various traditions arose before the early church uniformly decided that Sunday was the day of the resurrection and adopted it as its own chief festival day and observed it weekly as a celebration of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. The indication is that the adoption of Sunday by the church was independent of the three days motif. Investigation into the origin of Sunday would probably lead to a consideration, on the one hand, of conflicts of the early church with the synagogue over Sabbath observance; on the other, to the religious observance and celebration of Sunday already prevalent at the time in the ancient world.[20] It was noted then, after Sunday had been adopted on other grounds that it synchronized with one version of the three days motif, and that gave greater meaning and significance to its observance, for now the weekly celebration of this day was to rejoice over the Lord's resurrection. "On the third day" was then able to displace all rival versions of the three days motif and became the uniform, official view of the church, so that the other

[20] On the celebration of the *dies solis* in the ancient world, for the present, I here refer only to its place in Mithraism as shown by Franz Cumont, *Textes et Monuments Figures relatifs aux Mystères de Mithra*, 2 vol., (1896—99), vol. I, pp. 119, 325, 339. And within Jewish circles, some significance may attach to the custom of the Karaite Sadducees and the Samaritans of always making the date of the firstfruits offering, and so also of Pentecost, fall on Sunday, i. e., the day following the regular Sabbath of the feast of unleavened bread, instead of the first day of the feast, by virtue of that fact also a Sabbath, as was the general custom. Cf. B. W. Bacon, *The American Journal of Theology*, vol. xv, (1911), pp. 372—403: "The Resurrection in Primitive Tradition."

versions of the motif have been preserved only accidentally. When the identification of Sunday with "on the third day" had been made each was an irrefutable evidence in support of the other. And when the tradition of "on the third day" and the observance of Sunday had been adopted, authoritative validation was found in the scriptures, although at first there was no specific passage which could be cited in proof of the positions; but in time scriptures were found which were interpreted to satisfy the needs of the case[21]. And so they have been interpreted through the different centuries of the church.

[21] Justin, *Apol.* 67, refers to the statement of Genesis that the first day of creation was Sunday; and, in *Dialogue* 41, to circumcision on the eighth day.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE NAME NOAH IN GEN. 5 29.

E. G. KRAELING
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

WITHIN the Priestly genealogy of the Sethites in Gen. 5, verse 29 appears as a precious nugget from an older source. The author, doubtless the Jahwist, presents us with an interesting explanation of the name Noah. According to the MT it is combined with the root *niḥ(ḥ)am* "comfort." Ancient Rabbis like Johanan and Simeon b. Lakish already objected to this etymology and claimed that "Noah" ought to be derived from *nūᵃḥ*, or that the name ought to be Naḥman instead of Noah.[1] We may note, too, that the etymology cited in Enoch 106 18 also operates with the Hiphil of nūᵃḥ, in the secondary meaning "to be left over." An emendation of the text to *jeniḥēnū* "he will cause us to rest" is indeed necessary, for it seems incredible that the Jahwist should have gone out of his way to avoid the verb nūᵃḥ. Furthermore, the διαναπαύσει of the LXX indicates that the form *jenaḥamēnū* did not come into our MT until the late Jewish period. In our opinion this change occurred in the interest of Messianic prophecy. We need only remind the reader of the importance of the idea of the "comfort" of Israel from the time of Deutero-Isaiah on. "This one will comfort us" immediately suggested the Messiah.

[1] Goldziher, "Zur Geschichte der Etymologie des Namens Noah," Zeitschr. d. Deutschen Morgenländ. Ges., 1870, 207 f. Cp. *Bereshith Rabba*, Sec. 25.

If we accept *jeniḥēnū* "he will cause us to rest" as the correct text, it would seem that the most firmly entrenched interpretation of the passage, viz., that it refers to Noah's discovery of wine, is without any foundation at all. The O. T. nowhere makes any allusion to the "restful" effect of this beverage. But even if "he will comfort us" were original we must consider that interpretation far fetched. Budde who advocated it in the most forceful manner,[2] refers to the cup of consolation, Jer. 16 7, in support of his claim. But the verb "comfort" is not used anywhere else in connection with wine. In our opinion the cup of consolation gets its name, not from the effect of the wine, but rather from the fact that it is offered to the mourner by those striving to console him. As Prov. 31 6–7 shows, wine can help a man to forget his troubles, and this clearly is the purpose of the "cup of consolation." Ordinarily wine is connected with joy and good fellowship. Wine causes the hearts of gods and men to rejoice (Ps. 104 15); a man's heart becomes "good" when he has imbibed of it (2 Sam. 13 28). It seems unnatural to suppose that the disgraceful occasion related in Gen. 9 20 f. should have suggested the "cup of comfort" or that the author should have uttered the pious words of 5 29 with that particular anecdote prominently in mind.

The question, what does J mean by saying "This one will cause us to rest" etc., very naturally raises the other as to the real origin of Noah's name. We must briefly enter into that matter before we can arrive at a satisfactory explanation of the Jahwistic interpretation of it.

Since the flood story is clearly of Babylonian origin the name of the hero of the flood ought to be Babylonian.[3] But when we turn to the Babylonian sources we find that the flood—hero bore the old Sumerian name Zi-u(d)-sud-ra, signifying "Life unto

[2] Budde, *Biblische Urgeschichte*, 1883, 306f.

[3] Haupt, *Purim*, 27, compared the Babylonian personal name *Nuḫija*. Since the root "to rest" occurs also in the Akkadian it is not surprising to find a name formed from it. But that does not explain the name Noah, which manifestly must have some relation to the story concerning the hero.

distant days."[4] Now this name was manifestly created on the basis of the conclusion of the Babylonian versions of the flood-story according to which the hero received immortality. The true name of the king of Shurippak who was glorified by means of this tale has evidently been totally eclipsed. When Berossos, in the Hellenistic period, wrote a resumé of the flood-story for his *Babyloniaca* he used the old Sumerian name Ziusudra, transcribed as Xisouthros, for the hero. Now in the Ninevite recension the name is written Ud-zi. To understand this, it seems to me, we must suppose Zi-u(d)-sud-ra to have been abbreviated very commonly to **Zi-ud*, for in accordance with a Sumerian idiosyncrasy this could also be written *Ud-zi* (just as *^{d}En-zu* could be written *^{d}Zu-en*). One would expect Sumerian *Ud-zi*, if it were to be translated into Akkadian at all, to be rendered *Ūm-napishtim*.[5] But apparently this was not done, for an old Babylonian fragment of the epic writes "*U-ta-na-iš-tim*," which seems to establish the reading Ūt-napishtim.[6] According to Meissner the Akkadian name signifies "Lebensfinder(?)."[7] The more obvious rendering Ūm-napishtim must have been avoided because "day of life" did not convey a significance suited to the figure.

The question now arises, what is the relation of the name Noah to Ziusudra? In view of the Babylonian origin of the flood-story it seems likely that the Canaanite version at least chose a name which conveyed the same idea concerning the hero as the Babylonian names that we have just discussed attempted to do. We saw that the latter originated in the story concerning the attainment of immortality on the part of the flood hero. May not the

[4] So written in the Sumerian version of the flood-story published by Poebel, *Historical Texts*, 1914, 14f. In the text published by Langdon, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1923, 251f., the name appears as *Zi-u(d)-sud-du*. There is no difference in the meaning of the two forms.

[5] Clay, *Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform*, 1922, 12, advocates this rendering.

[6] Meissner, *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiat. Gesellschaft*, 1902, lf.

[7] Cp. *Babylonien und Assyrien* II, 1925, 113.

same thing apply to the name Noah? True the Hebrew version of the flood-story has eliminated the motif of the hero's translation. This was necessary because the Jahwist wanted to make Noah the ancestor of the living races of men. But we may well suppose that earlier Palestinian versions of the flood-story faithfully retained this very important part of the original Babylonian legend. Assuming that this was the case and that the name Noah, like the names Ziusudra and Ut-napishtim, bore a relation to that particular phase of the story it seems possible to clear up its origin. The root *nūᵃḫ*, from which Noah is manifestly derived, means first of all "to settle down," and then "to rest." If "Noah" be an inf. abs. of the verb it might describe the hero as the one who is in the state of having settled down, or who is at rest. We may compare the phrase in Prov. 21 16, "In the assembly of the shades shall he settle down;" the word could be used equally well of one who has joined the company of the immortals. When P speaks of the ark as resting or settling down on Mt. Ararat, 8 4, it is evident that this pun on the name Noah approaches the true meaning of the name more closely than the etymology given in 5 29. It is a last faint remembrance of the fact that the hero had settled down at the *pī narāti* or "source of the rivers,"[9] a land so distant that the Gilgamesh epic speaks regularly of him as "the remote one."

We may now turn to 5 29 once more and inquire as to what J means when he says: "This one will cause us to rest from our labor, etc." Procksch connects the pun of the Jahwist with Noah's sacrifice (8 21); the latter, he says, redeemed the earth from the curse that lay upon it since 3 17.[10] But 8 21 merely expresses a determination on the part of Jahweh to refrain from causing another flood; the curse of 3 17 is by no means removed from the race. One is at a loss to see, therefore, how the sacrifice of

[8] Goldziher, *l. c.*, says the Arabs connected it with the root *nāḥa* "planxit," and cites a curious legend concerning the weeping of Noah. But the etymology is impossible.

[9] Cp. Gressmann, *Archiv für Orientforschung*, III, 12.

[10] Procksch, *Die Genesis*, 1913, 56.

Noah could give people rest from their labor. It seems to us that we can only understand this Jahwistic interpretation if we bear in mind that which is so clear in the Babylonian version, viz., that Noah is a saint. When Xisouthros is asked whither he would journey with the great ship he answers, "to the gods to appeal unto them for weal for mankind." He is a friend of man and a mediator between him and the divinities. The way in which he deals with Gilgamesh in the epic, and the fact that he became a great wise man (hence his title *Atraḫasīs*, "the arch-wise one") who gave moral counsel to his children,[11] is of interest in this connection. To some extent he reminds of Moses, who is also the hero of a disappearance story, and the great teacher and monitor of his people, and a mediator between God and man.

It has long been recognized, on the basis of the Babylonian version, that the flood-hero has attracted solar mythology to his person.[12] The saint or hero Ziusudra has simply assumed the role of the god of light in his passage aboard the ark to the mountain top and in his entry into the land of the gods. But Usener has also shown how in the Mediterranean form of the flood-legend the myth of the birth of the god of light has been combined with the flood myth, for "Deucalion" is nought else than the infant Zeus. The "Truhenmärchen" of the infant god in the ark, which appears also in the Bible in the Mosaic birth-legend, has been attracted to the myth of the god who journeys across the heavenly ocean in the ark and lands on the mountain. Now in Gen. 5 29, it will be observed, we have the nucleus of a perhaps more extended birth-legend of Noah. It is attractive to suppose that Enoch 106 1 f. has preserved it for us. At all events, if we identify the infant Noah with the infant sun god, as is suggested by Enoch, the whole matter is plain, for as Norden has shown the birth of the god of light is associated with the winter solstice.[13] The Canaanitic or early Hebrew farmer could regard the

[11] Cp. Meissner, *Babylonien* etc., 421f.

[12] Cf. Usener, *Die Sintflutsagen*, 1899, 80f. 256f.; cp. also Poplicha, "A sun myth in the Babylonian Deluge Story," *JAOS*, 1927, 289f.

[13] Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes*, 1924, 14f.

solstice as ushering in his season of rest after the toil of spring, summer and autumn. Mythically speaking it was the birth of the solar babe that brought him relief. This motif has assumed the guise of legend in the popular lore of the Hebrews; the sun-god appears as a saint of olden times, the ancestor of the races of men. It is no longer quite clear, however, in what way the birth of the saint could spell rest for the farmer unless he was viewed as a sort of calendaric figure that was remembered at a particular season.

While it is not our purpose here to deal with the flood-story as such in detail, the explanation of 5 29 which we have just given suggests a reason for its popularity that may be pointed out in conclusion. The arrival of the rainy season was an occasion of great joy to the inhabitants of Palestine, not only because it afforded the farmer a period of rest, but also because the fertility of the soil and the success of the next harvest depended upon an abundant rainfall at this time. But, on the other hand, one can easily see how the mind could contemplate the possibility and the consequences of an excessive rain-fall. The flood-story of Babylonia provided a legend that could be applied in this way. In the J narrative the flood is the result of a winter-rain (*geshem*) that continued incessantly for forty days and nights. The ancient Hebrew devoutly hoped that no such calamity would again occur and hence it was a valuable thing to know that Jahweh had promised that he would never again send a deluge upon the earth. But it was also important to remind God of his promise. The ancestral hero had shown how this could be done: by bringing a sacrifice to the deity and causing him to smell the sweet savor. The flood-story as such has all the earmarks of a cult-legend that was used in connection with a seasonal festival.

THE HABIRI OF THE EL-AMARNA TABLETS AND THE HEBREW CONQUEST OF PALESTINE

GEORGE A. BARTON
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
AND THE PHILADELPHIA DIVINITY SCHOOL

IT has been recognized by many scholars during the last fifty years that there are in the Bible two traditions of the Hebrew conquest of Palestine, one tradition representing the invaders as coming from the south, and the other as coming from the east. It has also been noted by several scholars that the archaeological evidence is conflicting, the El-Amarna letters (if the Habiri are Hebrews, as many scholars believe them to be) placing the conquest in the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty, while the combined evidence of the cities Pitum and Raamses and of Ex. 1 11 puts it in the nineteenth dynasty. The literature on the subject up to the year 1913 was summarized by Professor L. B. Paton in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXXII, 1—53, who held that there were two conquests, one in the El-Amarna period and the other about 1200 B. C. This view the writer adopted,[1] and although powerful arguments have been made by some in favor of supposing that all the Hebrew tribes entered Palestine in the El-Amarna period,[2] it still seems to him the most probable view. The writer identified the Habiri with the Leah tribes as Steuer-

[1] See his *Religion of Israel*, New York, 1918, ch. III; 2nd ed., Philadelphia, 1928.

[2] See, e. g., J. W. Jack, *The Date of the Exodus*, Edinburgh, 1925.

nagel[3] and others had done, and supposed that it was the Rachel tribes who were in Egypt.

If this theory be true, the conquests of the Habiri in the El-Amarna period should have secured for them northern and southern Palestine, leaving central Palestine, where the tribes of Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin afterward obtained a foothold. Another consequence of the truth of the theory would be that Biblical narratives which relate the conquest of those portions of Palestine occupied by the Leah tribes really refer to the El-Amarna period and not to the time of Joshua. When these tests are applied they work out so as surprisingly to confirm the theory.

The letters of Abdi-Hepa of Jerusalem[4] show that the Habiri were overrunning the territory over which he ruled. His letters make it evident that he ruled an extensive region, including what was afterward northern Judah, and that his territory extended westward so as to include Beth-shemesh, and northward to Mount Carmel. We learn from Abdi-Hepa that the Habiri were pushing into Gath, Lachish, and Gezer; Beth-shemesh and Keileh had gone over to them. They were also attacking Jerusalem, which apparently fell into their hands, for Abdi-Hepa's letters cease. The Habiri of whom he writes appear to have pushed up from the south along the Philistine plain. According to Judges 1 1—15 the children of Judah made a similar attack from the south and captured the city of Jerusalem. It does not seem unlikely that this passage in Judges refers to a slightly later stage of the war described by Abdi-Hepa, and that it was this capture of Jerusalem which caused Abdi-Hepa's letters to cease.

The impression conveyed by the letters of Abdi-Hepa is confirmed by letters of his contemporaries. Lapaya and Malkiel, to whom he refers, wrote, the one telling how an influential man

[3] *Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan*, Berlin, 1901 p. 123.

[4] See J. A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna-Tafeln*, Leipzig, 1912, Nos. 286—290.

had gone over to the Habiri,[5] and the other[5] appealing that the land of the king might be saved from them. Yapahi, king of Gezer, wrote[6] to the Egyptian monarch voicing the same appeal, while men whose names are lost declared "the Habiri are stronger than we."[7] To this period would belong the Hebrew conquest of Arad, Nu. 21 1–3.

Meanwhile the Habiri were making an equally successful attack on the northern part of the country. Rib-Adda, king of Gebal, declared the Habiri were at Beirut,[8] and that they were fighting against Gebal.[9] The king of Sidon, Zimrida, complained "all my cities are in the hands of the Habiri."[10] A writer whose name is lost testifies that the Habiri were in Ashtaroth and Bosra in the Hauran.[11] According to Winckler's rendering[12] Itakama of Kinza declared the Habiri to be in Kadesh, but Knudtzon is undoubtedly right[13] in reading "Takhshi" instead. Abdi-Hepa of Jerusalem testifies, however, that they were in Bethshean, and that Shechem was likely to fall into their hands.[14] It thus is evident from the tablets that the Habiri were successfully invading all parts of the country.

If this conquest of Palestine was a conquest of the tribes that were afterward said to be descended from Leah, it is to be expected that in the lapse of time their triumphs would be confused in the minds of those who recounted stories of national heroes with the victories of Joshua, the leader of the Rachel tribes in their later

[5] See Knudtzon, *op. cit.*, Nos. 246 and 271.

[6] Knudtzon, No. 299.

[7] Knudtzon, No. 305.

[8] Knudtzon, No. 87.

[9] Knudtzon, No. 68.

[10] Knudtzon, No. 144.

[11] Knudtzon, No. 197.

[12] *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, IV, No. 146.

[13] Knudtzon, No. 187. W. Max Müller seems to have been right in placing Takhshi in northern Syria (*Asien und Europa*, etc., 258), for Itakama makes several references to the Hittites. It must not be supposed that the Habiri who were warring in northern Syria were necessarily Hebrews. The Habiri whom we have identified with the Leah tribes were only a fraction of the Habiri; see the writer's article in the *American Historical Review*, Vol. XXXIII (July, 1928), pp. 782f.

[14] Knudtzon, No. 289.

invasion of the country. This appears to have occurred. In Joshua 11 1–15 we have the story of the defeat of Jabin, king of Hazor, by the "Waters of Merom," the site of whose fortress Dr. Garstang identified in 1926. The text in which the account is found is as late as the Deuteronomic editor, but the victory is probably a victory belonging to the period of the Habiri, and represents the struggle by which they gained possession of the Upper Jordan Valley and of Galilee.

Similarly the subjugation of Sihon, the Amorite, king of Heshbon, whose land became the country of the Reubenites (Nu. 21 21–31), is but another item in the story of the invasion of the Habiri. If, then, we combine these Biblical narratives with the El-Amarna letters, it would seem that the Habiri, or Hebrews, were sweeping into the whole of Palestine in the fourteenth century B. C.

If this were the case, the question naturally arises, how did it happen that central Palestine—the territory of Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasseh—was still inhabited by Canaanites and Hittites in the time of Joshua, and were accordingly fair prey for the invading Rachel tribes some two hundred years later. In answering this question, it is to be noted that Abdi-Hepa does not say that Shechem was conquered; he only intimates that its conquest appeared imminent. Further, if the stories concerning the sons of Jacob in the Book of Genesis are tales of personified tribes, that book affords us the answer. The attempts of the Habiri upon this region were unsuccessful. The account in Gen. 33 18–34 31 of the treachery of Simeon and Levi in their dealings with Hamor the Shechemite and the ill repute which they gained by it, combined with the older poem in Gen. 49 5–7, would seem to show that some severe reverse was experienced here by these tribes which was regarded as a just retribution for their treachery.

> Simeon and Levi are Brethren;
> Weapons of violence are their swords.
> O my soul, come not thou into their council;
> Unto their assembly, my glory, be not thou united;
> For in their anger they slew a man,

And in their selfwill they houghed an ox.
Cursed be their anger for it was fierce,
And their wrath for it was cruel:
I will divide them in Jacob,
And scatter them in Israel (Gen. 49 5–7).

Apparently in this unsuccessful attempt these tribes suffered a reverse which nearly annihilated them, and from it they never fully recovered. Thus the effort of the Habiri to conquer central Palestine failed, and it was left a fair field for the campaigns of Joshua. This accounts for the fact that the efforts of Joshua, as described in the first ten chapters of the book which bears his name, were confined to the central part of the country.

The Biblical material and that of the El-Amarna Letters fit together so admirably, when the fact of two invasions is postulated, that it seems a strong confirmation of the theory.

CONTINUITY AND DIVERGENCE IN THE JESUS-PAUL PROBLEM

FRED GLADSTONE BRATTON
BOSTON UNIVERSITY

1. *Statement of the Problem.*

THE purpose of this paper is to ascertain the degree of agreement and dissimilarity between the teachings of Jesus and Paul and to account for both phenomena. The problem involved is manifest and its attempted solution is justified in view of the contradictions evident in the various theories hitherto proposed relative to the Jesus-Paul situation. The existence of views which are diametrically opposed to each other, the respective exponents being dogmatically certain (!) of the validity of their theories, argues the probability of a synthetic solution. Thus:

A

Theory that Paul effected a complete break with the original Christian community, and founded a new Gentile Christianity independently, on the basis of his own theology (Wrede, Brückner, Pfleiderer).

B

Theory that Paul agreed with Jesus' teachings in every department of thought and his system shows distinct dependence on the Jesus Tradition (Feine, Resch, Titius).

C

Theory that Paul is explained chiefly on the basis of Judaism; that the dominant influence in Pauline teaching was Jewish eschatology, and that he was not affected by Hellenic culture (Schweitzer, Spitta, Kabisch).

D

Theory that Paul was influenced by the Mystery Religions in his doctrinal forms and chiefly in the sacraments, in which he introduced a sacramental or physical significance (Reitzenstein, Heitmüller, Dieterich).

In the above diagram, A and B are deadlocked over the issue of Paul's relation to the Jesus Tradition, A claiming complete divergence, and B, complete agreement. In the C versus D issue, a divergence in Paul from Jesus is assumed, and they oppose each other in the source of this divergence, C resorting to Judaism, and D to Hellenism. Now, if the comparative analysis of the Pauline and Mark-Q text proves that all four schools contain an element of truth, we must look for the solution of the problem in the verification and explanation of both divergence and continuity. Such a comparative study must embrace the following subjects: God, Kingdom of God, Eschatology, Religious Values and Ethical Principles, The Law, Soteriology, Christology, and The Sacraments.

2. *Comparative Study.*

A thorough and disinterested investigation of parallels shows that Paul agrees with Jesus in his religious conception of God. Both exhibit God as a father of love. Both Jesus and Paul are interested primarily in the religious and personal rather than the speculative aspects of the subject. This must be qualified by a divergence in Paul which is secondary and which arises from a philosophico-soteriological interest, namely, the emphasis on God's relation to the world of sin and man's problem of reconciliation. But, generally speaking, Jesus and Paul are clearly in agreement in their teaching of the omnipotence and unity of God, His benevolence and personal love for His children, and His requirement of high character on the part of the members of His Kingdom. (Comparative references: Eph. 5 1 and Mt. 5 48; Eph. 4 32 and Mt. 6 14; Rom. 11 23 and Mk. 10 27; 1 Cor. 8 6 and Mk. 12 29; Rom. 1 25 and Mk. 10 6; Rom. 9 19 ff. and Mt. 5 45; Phil. 4 6 and Mt. 6 25, 26; Rom. 8 14 and Mt. 5 9).

Paul's agreement with Jesus in the idea of the Kingdom of God lies not so much in the apostle's use of the phrase "Kingdom of God" as in the identity of idea. The conception of the Kingdom of God for both Jesus and Paul was a mixed one; they regarded it as a future Messianic event and also as an ethico-spirit-

ual state. The latter emphasis was predominant in the teachings of both. Salvation for Jesus was to be in the Kingdom of God, for Paul it was to be ἐν χριστῷ, an identity of meaning although couched in different phraseology. (Comparative references: Rom. 14 17 and Mt. 5 6, 9; 1 Cor. 6 9a and Mt. 6 33; 1 Cor. 15 24 and Mk. 1 15).

There is an undeniable dependence of Paul on the Jesus tradition in Eschatology. Both draw heavily on Jewish imagery and traditional Jewish apocalyptic in their conception of the parousia, the judgment, and the future life. Paul's conception of the last things was more Christocentric than that of Jesus on account of the apostle's christological ideas. But, in both, it must be conceded, the spiritual message transcends eschatology. (Comparative references: 1 Thess. 4 15, 16 and Mk. 9 1; 1 Thess. 4 17 and Mk. 13 26, 30; 1 Thess. 5 2 and Mt. 24 43; 2 Thess. 1 7 and Mk. 8 38; 2 Thess. 2 1 and Mt. 24 31; 2 Thess. 2 2, 3 and Mt. 24 6; 2 Thess. 2 4 and Mt. 24 15; 2 Thess. 2 8, 9 and Mt. 24 24; Rom. 2 5, 6 and Mt. 10 32, 33; 2 Cor. 5 10 and Mt. 25 31 ff.; Rom. 2 6 and Mt. 16 27; Rom. 14 12 and Mt. 12 36).

In religious teachings and ethical principles there is an unqualified agreement between Paul and Jesus, reaching its highest and clearest expression in the inseparable connection between religion and the moral life. The *summum bonum* of life is the same for both: the supreme place of love and its moral imperative, service. This is the epitome of prophetic utterance in both men and is the point of greatest contrast to paganism. Jesus' supreme faith in the goodness of humanity and the divine destiny of man (an idea arising from his conception of the filial relation of men to the heavenly Father) does not appear so noticeably in Paul, owing to the latter's theory of sin and redemption. But in spiritual values, Paul was not only the Jesus preacher but the living expression of Jesus' ideal of life. In the category of religion and the moral life, Paul's life is the greatest proof of his agreement with Jesus. (Comparative references: Gal. 5 14 and Mt. 22 39; Rom. 12 9 and Mk. 7 6; Rom. 12 14 and Lu. 6 28; Col. 3 13 and Mk. 11 25; Rom. 12 17a, 1 Cor. 6 7b, Rom. 12 21, 1 Thess. 5 15 and

Mt. 5 39 f.; Gal. 6 1 and Mt. 18 15; 1 Cor. 8 11, 13, Rom. 14 13 ff. and Mt. 25 40, Mk. 9 42; Rom. 12 3 and Lu. 14 8—11; Rom. 2 1 and Mt. 7 1 ff.; 2 Cor. 8 12 and Mk. 12 43, 44; 1 Cor. 6 9, 10 and Mk. 7 21—23).

For both Jesus and Paul, the Law had ceased to have an absolute significance; it was of secondary importance and was to be reinterpreted in the light of the higher, divine law. Both were interested in preserving the ethical element which was to be found in the Law, and they were equally impatient with the Pharisaic interpretation of the Law and with the laws of defilement. A comparative study reveals three points of divergence. Jesus' opposition to Judaism was practical and ethical rather than theoretical and formal. Paul's antagonism to the Law was theoretical and systematic, since he was compelled by the missionary character of his work to prove the secondary nature of the Law by his philosophy of history. Another difference was that Jesus' quarrel with Pharisaism was more radical than Paul's; it arose spontaneously upon occasion and was direct and uncompromising. Paul's antagonism to legalistic Judaism was deliberate and conciliatory. No attempt was made by Jesus to reconcile the Judaistic system with his own Gospel; Paul, on the other hand, believed that Israel was destined to have a contributory significance in the achievement of the world's salvation. The third difference lay in the background of their opposition to Pharisaism. Paul knew Pharisaism more accurately than Jesus because of his rabbinical training, while Jesus was brought up in a rural, unintellectual environment. Consequently, Paul's anti-Pharisaism was intellectual and argumentative; that of Jesus was practical and pietistic. (Comparative references: Rom. 3 31 and Mt. 5 17; Gal. 3 17—19 and Mk. 10 5—9; Rom. 14 14 and Mk. 7 15; Gal. 5 14 and Mk. 12 31; Rom. 2 17—23 and Mk. 7 8—13).

The subject of Soteriology involves first the meaning or content of salvation, and second the means of its acquirement. There is clear agreement between Paul and Jesus as to the actual nature of salvation: it is the God-like life, the life of fellowship with the divine. Repentance, faith, and pardon are for both the prerequi-

sites for the state of salvation. In the case of soteriology, however, we see the first serious difference between Paul and Jesus. Jesus' attitude toward sin was practical and unphilosophical whereas Paul's attitude was speculative and psychological. The divergence occurs, not in the religious conception of salvation, but in the explanation of its accomplishment. They agree in their definition of faith, but Paul differs from Jesus in making the latter himself the object of faith and communion in his description of the saved life. In regard to the relationship between the death of Jesus and salvation, Jesus viewed his approaching death as an integral part of his life, a necessary climax to his mission in establishing God's kingdom, self-imposed (as far as predestination is concerned), and not a necessary condition for the securing of God's pardon of man's sin. Paul, on the other hand, regarded the death of Jesus as securing man's deliverance from sin, as redeeming man from this evil world, as accomplishing a reconciliation between man and God, and as an instrumental element in the accomplishment of man's salvation. (No comparative references in Soteriology, Christology, and Sacraments.)

An examination of the two bodies of teaching with reference to Jesus' self-consciousness and Paul's Christological ideas discloses a still wider divergence. Jesus considered himself to be the Messiah, not the long-expected Jewish, national Messiah, but the leader of the spiritual kingdom of God. The Messianic idea was a means to an end in the mind of Jesus, an inadequate form at best. He used the term "son of man" to designate his messianic leadership and spiritual uniqueness, and at the same time, used it as a means of protection. Jesus' sonship from his own point of view was ethical and spiritual, rather than metaphysical. The term "Son of God" as applied to Jesus refers to his consciousness of perfect harmony with the Father and to his messianic significance. Jesus' unique relation to the Father rests on an ethical and spiritual identity, the consciousness of a supreme, sinless character, aligned in a superior way to the Father's will. The consciousness of Jesus regarding his own significance was gradually developed in a ascending scale, and in a subjective rather

than an objective manner. The facts of Jesus' experience as recorded in the Synoptics preclude his possession of foreknowledge and likewise his preexistence. Paul's christological teaching was concerned almost exclusively with the exalted and mystical Christ. For Paul, Christ was preexistent in heaven, shared in creation, gave up his divine existence, came to earth as a man, lived and died for man's salvation, was exalted as Lord, and was to return to judge the world and establish God's kingdom. Christ was the "second Adam" who established the reign of righteousness. In his state of exaltation, Christ is God's mediator and executive. Paul's idea of Jesus' sinlessness differs from that of Jesus himself; Paul accounted for Jesus' sanctity by his preexistent and essential relation to God, while Jesus' experience from the Wilderness to the Garden of Gethsemane is eloquent testimony to the fact that his perfection of character was the result of profound moral struggle. Paul's theory of preexistence finds no support in Jesus' own words. As to Messiahship, with Jesus it was a constant struggle to determine in his own mind the kind of Messiah he was to be, and a greater struggle to remain that kind; but with Paul, the Messiahship of Jesus was predestined and mechanically necessary as the second Adam. In consideration of the duality of Paul's Christological thought, the mystical experience of the exalted Christ and the theoretical explanation of the exaltation of Christ, there is in the actual experience of both a community of thought: Jesus felt himself to be the son of God, possessing unique spiritual power; Paul found in Christ this secret of power, God's spirit. Jesus said: "Follow me"; Paul said: "Follow Christ." (But this agreement lies in the category of religious experience; *vide* above.)

The analysis of both sets of teaching relative to Sacraments offers a self-evident divergence. The best textual evidence in the Synoptic tradition indicates that Jesus in his last supper with the disciples desired to impress upon their minds in a symbolic manner the significance of his approaching death, a death for others, for all men, representing it by the broken bread and the poured wine. That he intended to leave with his followers a

memorial institution is doubtful, much less a sacrament for ritualistic use among his followers. Paul regarded the Lord's Supper as a sacrament, in which the believer, by partaking of the elements, was united with Christ in mystic fellowship. It is not necessary to see in his conception of the Lord's Supper a magical or physical efficacy; it is merely a figurative participation in Christ's death. That Jesus commanded his disciples to baptize their converts with a trinitarian formula is not borne out by the actual facts, since they baptized only into his own name. (The text in question, moreover, is from a later hand; Mt. 28 19). Jesus cannot be regarded as having instituted a Christian baptism, since there is not even a tradition to that effect. Baptism, which in the primitive Christian community had been practised as a symbol of repentance and preparation for the Kingdom, with Paul assumed a more sacramental character, but he did not necessarily regard it as being the means or sole condition of salvation; nor did he necessarily give it a "*naturhaft*" efficacy. Baptism was the evidence of the believer's dying with Christ to sin and rising with Christ to holiness, an ethical transformation. The act of baptism was not *ex opere operato* the medium for the reception of the Spirit, but it was a sacrament presupposing faith on the part of the convert and symbolizing mystical union with Christ. Jesus had nothing to say about the Church. (The two Synoptic passages which report Jesus as having used the word ἐκκλησία are most probably editorial insertions: Mt. 16 18; Mt. 18 17). The idea of establishing a new society as distinct from the synagogue does not appear in Jesus' teaching. The word ἐκκλησία with Paul signified two things: either a local, organized church or the catholic church. The Pauline church had its officers: presbyters and deacons. The divergence in the field of sacraments and church life, then, is simply a matter of historical development.

The comparative study shows a profound agreement between Paul and Jesus in the definition of spiritual values, the criterion of religious experience, and the ethical import of religion. A divergence no less distinct is found in Pauline material that per-

tains to the theoretical explanation of the truths in which they agree. Agreement is seen in Paul's religious experience of Jesus' essential teachings; divergence is seen in Paul's theological explanation of Christ's person.

3. *Explanation of Continuity.*

The theory that the agreement between Paul and Jesus noticed above can be termed continuity is substantiated by literary and rational evidence. Continuity with the Jesus tradition is necessarily implied in Paul's five direct quotations of Jesus' teachings, along with which he is careful to distinguish his own authority from "the word of the Lord". (1 Cor. 7 10, 11, 12 and Mk. 10 11, 12; 1 Thess. 4 15, 16 and Mk. 9 1; 1 Cor. 9 14 and Lu. 10 7; 1 Cor. 11 23 and Mk. 14 22; Acts 20 35 and some lost saying of Jesus). The only plausible explanation of these quotations of the authority of Jesus is that Paul obtained the teaching through ordinary human channels; that is, contact with members of the original community from whom he received the sayings of Jesus. (Paul's statement, Gal. 1 11, 12, that he did not receive his gospel from man can refer only to the divine nature of his commission). Allowing for accidental resemblance and similarity by reason of appeal to a common Old Testament source, the general effect of the allusions of Paul to the sayings of Jesus is altogether favorable to the familiarity of the apostle with the Logia material. Paul's familiarity with the facts of Jesus' life is proved by his allusions to the details of Jesus' ministry and passion and to his character. The fact that Paul was interested primarily in the exalted Christ does not disprove his knowledge of the historical Jesus. The Pauline Epistles and Acts furnish abundant information concerning the sources of Paul's knowledge of the earthly life and words of Jesus. These references show that Paul came by his gospel through contacts with early Christian disciples, the leaders at Jerusalem, and the most informed men of the early community. To Paul's intercourse with Peter, Mark, Luke, and others must be added the probable information which he gained from the Christians whom he persecuted and also from the Damascus Christians.

The rational basis for assuming Paul's intimate knowledge of the teachings of Jesus and the facts of his life is a necessary and cogent part of the proof of continuity. Paul's conversion and entire ministry presuppose a familiarity with the facts of Jesus' life. The exigencies of his missionary work demanded investigations into the life of Jesus; his knowledge of the historical Jesus would be challenged by the opposition and the queries of both Jewish and Gentile audiences. Paul's supreme achievement, the Christianization of the Roman World, is explicable only on the assumption of his twofold experience: (a) a knowledge of the historical Jesus, and (b) a post-resurrection, mystical experience of Christ, both experiences being mutually consistent and compatible. His missionary work is psychologically inconceivable with only one of these two experiences. Much of the Pauline epistolary material is impossible of explanation aside from a definite knowledge of the Jesus tradition on the part of both the writer and the readers of the epistles. It is not to be expected that Paul could have lived and taught in the Christian communities, from which later sprang the Gospels themselves, without becoming familiar with the historical data about Jesus.

4. *Explanation of Divergence.*

Admitting the internal, spiritual agreement between Paul and Jesus and its primary importance, we are obliged to verify and explain the christological, soteriological, and sacramental divergence. The explanation of this divergence is found in the christological development within the primitive community in the period between Jesus' death and Paul's correspondence, and in the influence exerted upon Paulinism by non-Christian religions.

Paul "received" a christological tradition, which had developed within the early Christian community immediately after the death of Jesus: a belief in the Lordship of Jesus and an attempt to interpret his death as vicarious. This belief was influenced by some of Jesus' words relative to his death, by Old Testament messianic references, and by a Jewish theological background.

Paul heightened and centralized the idea of Jesus' Lordship and the redeeming efficacy of his death.

The sacramental development of the early community embraced the confession, baptism, and the common meal. The convert confessed Jesus as Messiah, was baptized into the name of Jesus, and was then admitted into the circle of followers. The Lord's Supper was a common meal in memory of Jesus. This early development along christological and sacramental lines, which Paul "received," argues strongly against the theory that the apostle originated a system of doctrine independently of the Jesus tradition. Paul's influence was not so much an innovation as the climactic crystallization along speculative and apologetic lines of the tradition which had been developing in the post-resurrection community.

The influence of Rabbinism in Paul's exegesis and of Jewish apocalyptic in his presentation of the preexistent Lord is unmistakable. The Jewish theological background of Paulinism and the primitive church is generally conceded.

In the last place, divergence is accounted for by the influence of Hellenism on the origin of Christianity. To recognize the religious and cultural environment of the Pauline churches as being essentially Greek, is to concede the possibility of Hellenistic influences in both the mystical and institutional aspects of Paul's work. Manifestly the Pauline Christians were affected in regard to forms and terminology by the pagan religions, in the midst of which they were living. Borrowing external forms from the Mystery Religions, however, would not necessarily imply a change in the original spiritual content or ideas of early Christianity. The analogies between the practises of the cults and those of the Pauline church in sacramental observances must be acknowledged, but conclusions regarding the exact nature and extent of the influence of the Mysteries on the Pauline sacraments cannot be determined with any certainty. Paul's idea of the Lord's Supper and of baptism was undoubtedly more mystical and sacramental than that of the early community, and in this divergence he may have been influenced to some extent by the modes of thought in the prevailing Graeco-Roman religions.

5. *Reconciliation of Continuity and Divergence.*

The recognition of the two elements in Paul, the religious and the theological, the mystical and the apologetic, is indispensable for a true estimation of Paul in his relation to Jesus. The occasional and apologetic character of the epistles accounts largely for the forensic elements. Just as Ezekiel's legalistic codification served to preserve Judaism against further syncretism, so Paul's formal interpretation of the Christian message helped to fortify the early Christian church against heresies. But behind all this is the distinctively religious Paul. The failure to give proper accent to the mysticism and religious conviction which underlie the framework of apologetics, explains the "Pauline" character of historic Christianity (i. e., the theological interpretation of Paulinism!). The normative element in Paul behind the divergent forms is the consistently repeated conviction, "God in Christ." Paul's spiritual *élan vital* was identical with that of Jesus—the creative power which is derived from personal fellowship with the divine. Paul's continuity with Jesus is seen in the realm of spiritual values: personal communion with God, the paramount importance of love, and the moral imperative of mysticism. Paul's final impression on the reader should be made, not by his method, but by his message, his convictions. Therein he maintained a definite connection with Jesus, because he practised the same kind of life that Jesus lived and died to uphold. To regard Paul as only a dogmatic theologian is to define him by his instrumental method, rather than by his actual life and spirit.

Continuity and divergence in Jesus and Paul are reconciled by the distinction between content and method; thus, the former is evident in Paul's preaching and living the essential spiritual convictions of Jesus, while the latter is evident in the apostle's apologetic explanation, in a new age and environment, of Christ's person and work.

The recognition of Paul's essentially spiritual gospel has a profound significance for the confused present-day study of the Jesus-Paul problem. The differences between Paulinism and the Gospel are obvious; the one comes to us largely in the form of

philosophic speculation; the other is clearly unreflective and untheological. Paul, in his technique, was an apologist and theologian—inevitably so. The first great thinker after Christ was bound to cast the Gospel in a theological mould; there has been no exception to that phenomenon of progress in any movement in the world's history. The expression in Hellenistic form of Paul's christological and sacramental ideas was also an ineluctable process. It was not to be expected that pure Jewish thought forms could serve in the Hellenization of Christianity.

Further, it is to be noticed that the historic movements of Christianity have "gone back to Paul" rather than to Jesus; that is, they have gone back to the theological Paul. Present-day writers, noting this, have set up the alternative, "Jesus or Paul," or have cried, "Back to Jesus." What is Christianity? Is it the historic Pauline construction, or is it the Synoptic, historical Jesus and the Sermon on the Mount? If the answer be made that true Christianity is, or ought to be, the latter, we agree: there is a difference between "Paulinism" and the historical Jesus. But that does not eliminate Paul; it merely rejects Paul's method. We cannot get rid of Paul's ἐν χριστῷ gospel, his message of love, by throwing away his modes of expression. What if the form of the Pauline construction was Hellenic? The validity of the ideas back of the expression is still unimpaired. Every age has its mode of expression, which is transient and good only for that age, and it is therefore natural that the modern world should rebel against the theology of Paul. He is not less but greater by being relieved of the temporary methods which he had to use, for under them lies the Gospel of Jesus Christ, true Christianity. The separation of Paul's religion from his theology is our task and it is the task of future Christian thinkers. No study of Paul is complete or fair until it has penetrated the forms of Paulinism and seized upon the religious spirit and experience of the apostle. Paul's message of love will outlast his system of reconciliation, for back of the inconsistent and unscientific explanations of Paul lies the object of his explanations, Jesus Christ.

The continuity with Jesus, an identity of spiritual values, re-

presents the more permanent phase of Paul's work; the divergent element is methodological and of secondary importance, but both phenomena must be recognized, verified, explained, and evaluated. When this process is completed, the historic developments of the Christian Church are better understood, and the present contradictory theories relative to Paulinism are explained. The synthetic approach is textually and logically sound and furnishes a satisfactory treatment of the Jesus-Paul problem.

SOME EMENDATIONS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

THEOPHILE JAMES MEEK
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

1. *Mic.* 4 1 = *Isa.* 2 2.

AS is well known, Mic. 4 1 appears in a slightly variant form in Isa. 2 2, and of the two scholars are quite universally agreed that the text of Micah is to be preferred. It gives a metrical structure (a 3 : 3 meter) that agrees with the rest of the poem, as the Isaiah text does not, and the parallelism is better. But even in Micah the parallelism is not all that is to be desired, as Gray has pointed out.[1] If יהיה in the first distich is merely a copulative, the second distich beginning with נכון would seem not to be sufficiently independent to constitute a distich. Hence Gray suggests that יהיה may here have a force greater than that of the mere copulative or auxiliary and mean "come into existence." The Septuagint, however, suggests a better solution of the problem. In Isaiah the two words, נכון יהיה, are translated by ἐμφανές, whereas in Micah, where the two words are separated, יהיה is translated by ἐμφανές and נכון by ἕτοιμον.[2] The translation ἐμφανές for

[1] *Isaiah* (ICC), p. 47.

[2] It has generally been supposed that the LXX has here a double rendering of נכון, viz. εμφανες and ετοιμον, and that והיה at the beginning of the verse is not translated; but this is clearly wrong, as even a casual comparison of the Greek and Hebrew texts will readily show. Scholars have been led astray by the fact that the Greek text of Isa. 2 2a is short one word, but if any word is untranslated, it is not והיה but נכון. εμφανες is assuredly not a translation of נכון.

יהיה is surely a strange one and is unparalleled elsewhere.[3] The fact that φαίνω is several times the translation of the Niphal of ראה[4] and the meaning of ἐμφανές itself would suggest that יהיה in the Mic.-Isa. passage must be a corruption of יחזה, which may be pointed as a Niphal, יֵחָזֶה, as the Greek translation would suggest, or as a Qal with indefinite subject, יֵחָזֶה, since the Niphal is not found in the Old Testament.[5] The verb, חזה, used as it is of the ecstatic vision, is a most appropriate one in this eschatological section; the reading meets the objection raised against יהיה, and it is easy to understand how יחזה could have been corrupted to יהיה. With this emendation, then, the passage would read very smoothly:

"It shall come to pass in days to come
That the mountain of Yahweh's house[6] shall be seen[7]
Established as the highest mountain,
And elevated above the hills."

2. *Judges* 3 22.

A passage that has given trouble to translators and commentators from the time of the ancient versions down to the present is Judges 3 22. Many emendations have been suggested to get sense out of the passage, but none has been satisfactory. To read הפרש in place of הפרשדנה, as has been generally done since the

[3] Outside of the Isa.-Mic. passage εμφανες appears only in Exod. 2 14 (translating the Niph. of ידע) and Isa. 65 1 (translating the Niph. of דרש), but the rendering in both cases is quite free and the passages offer little light on our present text, but do bring it under suspicion.

[4] See Hatch and Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint*, p. 1423.

[5] This is no serious objection, however, to the Niph. There is nothing impossible in the form and the fact that it does not appear only goes to show how scanty the Hebrew literature is that is left to us.

[6] This phrase occurs nowhere else and may be the result of a conflation of readings, as Gray suggests, *op. cit.*, p. 47. In that case the original reading was חר יהוה, "the mountain of Yahweh."

[7] If we read the Qal here, the literal rendering would be "one shall see the mountain of Yahweh's house," but the English equivalent of both the Niph. and Qal is that given above.

time of Nöldeke,[8] is too drastic a change. It has no support in the ancient versions and it is difficult to conceive how the corruption got into a text that was manifestly so plain.[9] The word, פרשדן, is clearly identical with the Akkadian *paraštdinnu*, the meaning of which is "hole, cleft," as is evidenced by its Sumerian equivalent *kirruda* and the synonym *ḫurru*.[10] The ending ה is naturally the locative, which appears again in the next verse. The subject of ויצא must be the same as the verbs in the immediate context, viz. Ehud, but the verb manifestly cannot be in the Qal stem as the Massoretic pointing makes it, since Ehud's exit is regularly related in the words immediately following.[11] In the difficulty no one seems to have thought of pointing the verb as Hiphil (וַיֹּצֵא), but to do so is immediately to clear up the whole trouble in the verse: "the hilt also went in after the blade, and the fat closed over the blade; for he did not draw the dagger out of his abdomen, but let it go into the hole."[12]

3. *Deut.* 11 2.

Ehrlich[13] seems to have been the first to discover what is really wrong with Deut. 11 2. Instead of inserting a verb after כי לא, as is universally done, he deletes these words as a gloss and in place of וידעתם היום he reads וְלִמַּדְתֶּם אֹתָם. This unquestionably restores the sense of the passage, but it is a rather drastic change, and one cannot but wonder how a text so plain and simple became so corrupted. A simpler emendation than Ehrlich's is וְיָדַעְתֶּם אֹתָם. This has the advantage of requiring no change at all in the consonantal text of the first word and makes it easy to understand how the text as a whole came to be corrupted, in that the Piel of ידע is found so seldom in the Old Testament (only once

[8] *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments*, p. 180 n.

[9] For other serious objections see Nowack, *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis*, pp. 27f.

[10] See Delitzsch, *Sumerisches Glossar*, p. 119.

[11] So Kittel and others have rightly observed.

[12] So I translate in *The Old Testament: An American Translation*, p. 382.

[13] *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, II, 280f.

in the MT, viz. Job 38 12)[14] that it was naturally misunderstood as a Qal and אתם was read (perhaps unconsciously) היום, since this appears so often in the book of Deuteronomy after the verb ידע. In the further effort to give the passage a meaning that would agree with the context כי לא was inserted, with the verb to be understood. The scribe manifestly had compunctions about adding too much to the text. That our emendation is probably the correct one is indicated, not only by the good sense that it gives the passage, but by the fact that it agrees with the context and with a sentiment characteristic of Deuteronomy, expressed elsewhere in this same chapter, verse 19, and in 4 9, 10; 6 7.

4. *Deut.* 11 30.

The difficulty in Deut. 11 30 is the word אחרי, and Rashi was clearly on the right track when he maintained that this word should be separated from that immediately following and translated as an adverb, "far away." But if we retain the pointing אַחֲרֵי, which is construct, this cannot be done. Ehrlich would solve the difficulty by pointing the word אַחֲרַי and making it the absolute state with the old feminine ending ַי on the basis of Prov. 28 23.[15] This is possible and has some support in his contention that אחר as plural would be pointed with suffixes אַחֲרֶיךָ, אַחֲרָיו, etc., which of course is true, as I had already discovered. Hence אַחֲרַי is manifestly not plural, but there is a better explanation of the form than Ehrlich's. Here is another of the several instances in Hebrew where we have the introduction of a helping vowel before the suffix, just as we have so regularly in Akkadian.[16] The *yodh* in אחרי is identical with the *yodh* that is inser-

[14] It certainly appears in at least one other place in the O. T., viz. Gen. 18 19 (see Ehrlich, *op. cit.*, I, 73f.), where the Massoretes read the Pi. as Qal and spoiled the sense of the passage, just as they did in Deut. 11 2.

[15] *Op. cit.*, II, 283f.; cf. VI, 163.

[16] E. g., "his lord" may be written *belšu*, without the helping vowel, but the more common form is *belišu*. The helping vowel is usually *i*, but *a* is also used and *u* less frequently. The phenomenon is found, not only in Hebrew and Akkadian, but in the other Semitic languages as well.

ted before the pronominal suffixes in the case of עד, אל, על, את, אב, חם, and other Hebrew words, and with the *yodh* that is sometimes found with the construct, e. g., פְּנִיאֵל (Gen. 32 31)[17], בְּנִי אֲתֹנוֹ (Gen. 49 11), חַכְלִילִי עֵינַיִם (Gen. 49 12), שֹׁכְנִי סְנֶה (Deut. 33 16), and רַבָּתִי עַם (Lam. 1 1),[18] and occasionally with the absolute, e. g., הַמַּגְבִּיהִי (Ps. 113 5) and הַיֹּשְׁבִי (Ps. 123 1).[19] Hence the preposition אחר with the helping *yodh* was originally pointed, not אַחֲרֵי as in the Massoretic Text, but אָחֳרִי,[20] i. e. it is singular and not plural, and is never found in Hebrew other than in the singular.[21] Hence it is to the singular form of the word that the suffixes are added, and the traditional vocalization indicates that it is a segholate or second declension noun, and in its absolute form it ought strictly to have the accent on the penult.[22] In view of these considerations Ehrlich's emendation for Deut. 11 30 does not seem acceptable, and I would suggest reading אָחֳרָיו in place of MT אַחֲרֵי, as indicated by the following expression, דרך מבוא

[17] Several of the ancient versions have here the variant פְּנוּאֵל, with the helping vowel *u* instead of *i*. This is the reading elsewhere in MT.

[18] For othe rexamples see Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*[28], § 90 1, but the ending ־ִי is of course not the remains of an early genitive case-ending, as there maintained, for the very good reason that it does not appear with the proper word for the genitive case-ending. The genitive ending can of course only appear with the second word of a genitive construction, not the first. G. R. Driver, *JThS*, XXVI, 76 f., was the first to connect the so-called *ḥireq compaginis* with the Akkadian helping vowel. I had already done so myself, but I carried the thesis farther than he and have done so in this article.

[19] For other examples see Gesenius-Kautzsch, *op. cit.*, § 90 m.

[20] The Massoretic pointing may be due to the fact that the word was mistakenly regarded as plural, or the original *i* vowel may have been modified in course of time to *e*, a phenomenon that is common in all the Semitic languages. This would explain such forms as מִשְׁכְּבֵי אָבִיךָ (Gen. 49 4) and רִכְבֵי פַרְעֹה (Cant. 1 9), which of course are sing. constr., not plur.

[21] The Akkadian equivalent is *arki*, with the helping vowel *i*; and *arkika*, "after thee," is the exact equivalent of אַחֲרֶיךָ.

[22] It is in form identical with the preposition תַּחַת, which likewise takes the suffixes with the helping vowel, but unlike אחר it has the accent in the correct position. Why in the case of אחר the accent should have been shifted to the ultima is difficult to understand.

חשמש, which is clearly explanatory of it. It is easy to see how the *waw* came to be accidentally dropped (by virtual haplography) and its restoration gives a sense to the passage that was manifestly the one intended: "Are they not beyond the Jordan, west of it, toward the sunset, in the land of the Canaanites who live in the Arabah, opposite Gilgal, beside the terebinths of Moreh?"

5. *Num.* 16 1.

As is readily apparent, the difficulty in Num. 16 1 is that the verb ויקח is left without an object. Most of the translators have assumed that there is an intentional ellipsis of the object "men", but this is highly improbable, as Gray has indicated.[23] Others have suggested that ויקח is a corruption of ויקם or ויקהל, but Ehrlich has given good reasons for the rejection of these emendations.[24] On the other hand he would strike out the phrase, ויקמו לפני משה, in verse 2 as a variant of ויקהלו על־משה in verse 3, and deleting the *waw* from אנשים, he would make this the object of ויקח. It was this suggestion that I followed in the *American Translation of the Old Testament*, but my attention has since been called to a Greek reading which seems preferable, viz., *καὶ ὑπερηφανεύθη* = וַיָּזֵד, cited by Holmes[25] and by Brooke and McLean,[26] and quoted from Holmes by Field.[27] It is easy to understand how ויזד could have been corrupted to ויקח and the emendation makes the passage run quite smoothly: "Now Korah, the son of Izhar, the son of Kohath, the son of Levi, along with Dathan and Abiram, the sons of Eliab, and On, the son of Peleth, the son of Reuben, became rebellious and took their stand before Moses, along with two hundred and fifty of the Israelites, leaders of the community, picked men of the assembly, men of note." The only objection to this translation is that before ואנשים in

[23] *Numbers* (ICC), p. 195.
[24] *Op. cit.*, II, 168.
[25] *Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, Vol. 1.
[26] *The Old Testament in Greek*, p. 467.
[27] *Origenis Hexapla*, p. 244.

verse 2 we ought strictly to have the pronoun הֵם,[28] but the awkward construction is not due to the accidental omission of הם, but rather to the fact that in Num. 16, as has long been recognized, we have two stories dovetailed together, the story of Korah and that of Dathan and Abiram. The second half of verse 1 and the first phrase in verse 2 belong to the story of Dathan and Abiram, so that the introduction to the story of Korah ran originally: "Now Korah, the son of Izhar, the son of Kohath, the son of Levi, became rebellious, along with two hundred and fifty of the Israelites, leaders of the community, picked men of the assembly, men of note."

[28] The awkwardness of the constructoin was noted by the scribe of Kennicott 6, who inserted לפני before אנשים, but this is manifestly not original

KINGSHIP IN EARLY ISRAEL

ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH
YALE UNIVERSITY

A little over a year ago I published an essay on "The Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship"[1] in which I proposed that kingship in the Hellenistic period was regarded primarily as consisting in the fact that the king was the νόμος ἔμψυχος. That is, he was the divine or natural law, however the higher law might be explained, become incarnate in a man who was thereby made unique among men. He was the mediator to society of the law of the universe. What commands he spoke became the statutory law of the realm, yet he himself, while he should obey his own laws as far as possible, was νόμιμος, not like his subjects in being obedient to the code, but in so far as his nature was itself the higher νόμος. Not every man could bear this gift, which was expressed in solar imagery as a streaming into his person of the divine fluid so variously interpreted in the Hellenistic world. Usurpers were blinded, afflicted with vertigo, and overthrown by its brilliance. The eagle, always a divine royal symbol, had traditionally alone among birds the power of gazing directly at the sun, and so the eagle came to be also the symbol of this aspect of royal power. But to be a true eagle the king must himself be just and righteous; he should be a magnificent person physically, so that his appearance could represent his divine superiority to his subjects. To look upon him should have the effect of putting the souls of his subjects in order, making them righteous as he

[1] *Yale Classical Studies* I (1928), pp. 51–103.

was righteous. He was their saviour, their shepherd, as with divine power he led them into victory and kept them in peace.

In the course of my study I became convinced that the idea, not originally Greek, had come into the Greek world from the east. Plato and Aristotle regarded such an ideal king as providing the perfect government, but viewed such government as impracticable since the supply of men of such transcendent qualities was, to say the least, uncertain. That is, though they, like Isocrates, were perfectly familiar with this idealized royalty, they treated the conception as obviously foreign to the city-state tradition they had received from Greece. At the same time the passages in Herodotus which I discussed, as well as those in Xenophon, Aelius, and in the Zend Avesta, seemed to indicate that royalty of this kind was as much at home in Persia as it was strange in Greece.

My assertion that Persian royalty was regarded in this way is strengthened by the description of Cyrus' rule contained in the great Cyrus cylinder, a document which I did not consider previously.[2] Here Cyrus explains why it is that Marduk and Nabu, the special patrons of Babylonian royalty, have used him to destroy the Babylonian dynasty. The opening part of the inscription, which is the most important for our subject, is unfortunately badly damaged, but enough of it can be deciphered to make it plain that the reason he alleges is that the Babylonian kings have been unworthy of the gods' further patronage. Weaklings have been put in rulership, laws instituted that were not suitable, improper persons have been allowed to make offerings, evil things for the state have been done daily, and a heavy yoke imposed upon the people.[3] It is in response to their cry for help that the gods have made the change in rule. Marduk, despairing

[2] Weissbach, *Keilinschriften der Achämeniden*, pp. 2ff. See Kittel, "Cyrus und Deuterojesaja," in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* XVIII (1898), pp. 149–162.

[3] The value of this picture of kingship is not affected by the fact that it is probably an entirely inaccurate picture of the depravity of Babylonian kings and of the virtue of Cyrus.

of the Babylonian dynasty, sought out among all the peoples a just prince after his own heart; Cyrus had the qualifications for his purpose, so Marduk took him by the hand, uttered his name, and gave him the rulership. Thus installed by Marduk, Cyrus now rules the black-headed in true right and justice. At last Marduk is satisfied, for a prince with a righteous heart rules his people, and their ills have all been removed. Cyrus' rule is beloved by Marduk and Nabu.

Before going on to indicate how the Babylonians described royal rule, it should be pointed out in passing that the subsequent Persian kings, who preferred to ascribe their kingship to Ahuramazda, continued to attribute to the god all their successes in conquering and in lawgiving.[4] And yet Darius recognized that the help of Ahuramazda was conditioned upon the legal integrity, and the spirit of helpfulness to the oppressed, which he himself had to offer: "Ahuramazda and the other gods brought me help because I was not malevolent, untrue, or violent, either I or my family. I proceeded according to justice and equity. I have never forcibly deprived a widow or a poor man. I have benefited any one who has done good to my house; I have sharply punished any one who injured it."[5] It was because Darius had these royal virtues that he had the gift of kingship from the gods. The king's relations with the gods consisted not merely in their generally helping him. "The great Ahuramazda, who is the greatest of the gods, he it is who has set up Darius as king; he it is who has endowed him with the ruling power; Darius is king by the will of Ahuramazda."[6] "Ahuramazda has endowed him with the ruling power."[7] The result was that he received the power of making law.[8]

It would then seem apparent that the kingly rule of the Persians as described in the Zend Avesta, and indicated in Herodotus and

[4] Weissbach, *op. cit.*, p. 14, § 9; p. 19, § 13, etc.; p. 12, § 8.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 67, § 63.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 80: Inscriptions from Persepolis, d, § 1.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 84, g, 1.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 88, Inscriptions from Naks-i-Rustam, 3.

the others, was the official Persian conception of the nature and function of kingship in the time of Cyrus and Darius. It is just as apparent that this sort of kingship, if it was not (as appears to me likely) borrowed from the Babylonians, was at least in close harmony with their conceptions. Indeed the inscription of Cyrus really represents him to the Babylonians as the ideal king for whom the people have always been looking, the Messiah we might say, who, by the combination of his own virtue with the gift of divine royal power and divine patronage, was to bring in the golden age of justice and salvation to all classes of society; while, like the prophets of Israel, Cyrus says that when the kings of a nation become too corrupt the gods of that very nation turn the people over to the rule of a foreigner.

The conception of kingship in Babylon has often been treated,[9] but no treatment that I have found recognizes the presence of that explanation of kingship which in the Hellenistic Age was called the νόμος ἔμψυχος. That the king must be righteous in judicial and legislative matters, be kind to the poor, the shepherd of his people, as well as the conqueror, these are so obvious in the material that they have long been recognized. But it seems to me that the idea of νόμος ἔμψυχος was clearly grasped in Babylonia and is the ultimate explanation of the nature of the rule of their kings. One of the earliest Sumerian kings, Eannadu, describes his rulership as follows: his name was pronounced by Enlil, he was endowed with strength by Ningirsu, he was the heart's selection of Nina, nourished with holy milk by Ninharseg, named with a good name by Innina, given understanding by Enki, beloved by Dumuziabzu.[10] Again, by his relation to the Sun-god, he is "the king enveloped in radiance."[11] This description does

[9] See especially Bruno Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien* (1920–1925) I, pp. 46ff., 147ff.; Lorenz Dürr, *Ursprung und Ausbau der israelitisch-jüdischen Heilandserwartung* (1925), 16ff. *et passim.*

[10] F. Thureau-Dangin, *Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königsinschriften*, p. 20, Feldstein A, 1, 2; cf. p. 22, Feldstein B, 1, 2; p. 26, Backstein A, 1, 2; etc.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 16, 1, lines 1ff. The solar description of royal power is especially important throughout this inscription.

not imply divine birth, for he states immediately that he is the son of Akurgal. The passages refer only to his investment with kingship. Perhaps the most striking is the statement that he was, as king, nourished with holy milk by Ninharseg, for here is the first reference to the divine fluid which brought into the king the royal power. These phrases became the stereotyped description of royalty in the period.[12] Gudea is the shepherd king, whose rulership has been a gift, apparently given to him in a dream.[13] He is the just shepherd, full of wisdom.[14] His heart is pure, and sends forth beams of light as the day.[15] Indeed Ningirsu has selected his heart for his dwelling place.[16] Gudea has justice for the oppressed as the symbol of perfect administration, a justice which is akin to the justice which streams down from the sun, and whose introduction into the city makes the city partake of the sun's virtue so that it too is radiant.[17] The solar origin of justice is a common motif in Babylonia.[18] Lugalzaggisi, founder of Sumerian hegemony, would seem to have aspired to be the shepherd king in the same sense as his predecessors.[19] Hammurabi received the law from the Sun-god, and then himself, like the Sun-god, illuminated the land, that is he received the god's nature and powers.[20]

Eannadu's references to the sun-radiance and the divine fluid are probably to be connected with the stream of rulership and justice to men so remarkably described in the very old hymn:

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 34, Backstein A, 1, 2 (Entemena).

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 90, 1, lines 26ff.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 116, 25, line 22; p. 128, 8, line 17; p. 134, 14, line 12. On the king as shepherd in Babylonia see Dürr, *op. cit.*, pp. 117ff.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 110, 19, line 28; p. 132, 13, line 4.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 132, 13, line 6.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 138, 17, 18.

[18] Meissner, *op. cit.* I, 148.

[19] Thureau-Dangin, *op. cit.*, p. 154f., 3, lines 14ff. Cf. Urninib, Pursin, Lipitishtar, Sinmagir on p. 204; Sinidinnam, on p. 209, line 13; Aradsin, on p. 214, d, line 11.

[20] Prologue to the Codex, Col. I, lines 27–49; see Dürr, p. 28.

Oh Stream, thou who hast created all things,
When the great gods dug thee out
They set grace upon thy banks;
In thee has Ea, king of the deeps, established his dwelling.
They gave thee a flood comparable to none other!
Fire and wrath, splendor and terror,
Have Ea and Marduk bestowed upon thee.
Thou judgest the cause of mankind.
Mighty Stream! Exalted Stream! Righteous Stream![21]

That this is a stream of rulership as well as of creation is made indisputable by the next to the last line quoted, where the stream is described as that which speaks justice to mankind. It is a stream which brings might, greatness, and justice, the three chief aspects of kingly rule.

Without attempting a history of the idea of kingship in Babylonia, it can still be shown by a few instances that this same conception of the king was retained throughout the duration of the Empire. The case of Asshurbanipal is typical. He too represented the gods to the people as the gods' obedient shepherd,[22] whose shepherding is pleasant to the black-headed;[23] he has the wisdom of Nabu, which he has tried to write down on his tablets (of laws),[24] an act which he otherwise describes as a gift of the gods; he has a special ear for hearing the divine instructions;[25] his name was made great by the gods,[26] has indeed been specially given or altered by them.[27] In return he obeys the gods' commands;[28] he is careful to be strictly just in his decisions;[29] he helps the weak against the strong;[30] his rulership even means

[21] L. W. King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation*, pp. 128f., 200f.
[22] Streck, *Assurbanipal* II, p. 352, line 5; 366, line 6.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 240, b, lines 13, 14; p. 244, line 20.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 4, line 31; p. 210, lines 8ff.; p. 344, lines 14ff.; p. 356, lines 7ff.; p. 358, d, lines 5ff.; p. 154, b, lines 29ff.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 92, lines 6ff.
[26] *Ibid.*, *loc. cit.*; also p. 286, line 17.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 292, lines 10, 17.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 300, line 9.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 280, line 13.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 236, line 13, *et passim.*

good crops.[31] That is, the rulership is primarily based upon a conception of the king as the one who brings the laws of the gods to man, whether by having the divine legal wisdom implanted in himself, or by his special faculty for hearing the gods' instructions.[32]

In Neo-Babylonia the kingly ideal is still the same. The rulership of Nabonidus is particularly the care of Nabu and Marduk,[33] and indeed Nabopolassar says that he is himself only the circumstances of their having stretched out the hand.[34] The king as a young man was of no importance until he had been chosen king by the gods, and they came to be the protecting spirit at his side.[35] Marduk made him just, that he might keep the land in order and protect the people.[36] Nebuchadnezzar is the true shepherd selected for the people by Marduk; he is the exalted ruler, the wise one, the preserver (saviour) of Esagila and Ezida, who knows the art of preserving.[37] As a result he is the king of justice,[38] in whose hand Nabu has put the scepter of justice,[39] a constantly recurring symbol of the fact that the king's rule brings divine law and justice to men. The king's justice is not his own, but is a gift of the gods. He, too, is wise because his ear is open to the ways of the great gods.[40] So equipped, his rulership means the salvation of his people.[41] At the same time the king's attitude is always very humble toward the gods.[42] His human origin is constantly borne

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 152, line 5ff.
[32] See Dürr, *op. cit.*, pp. 85f., 112.
[33] Stephen Langdon, *Neubabylonische Königsinschriften*, p. 60, lines 23ff.
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 64, 2, i, lines 1ff.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 66, 4, lines 8ff.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 72, lines 11ff.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 78, 3, lines 1ff.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 88, 9, lines 1ff.
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 98, i, lines 13ff.; p. 102, iii, lines 20ff.; p. 128, lines 18ff.; p. 144, 17, lines 24ff.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. 98, i, lines 4ff.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 102, iii, lines 11ff.; p. 120, lines 42ff.
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 142, lines 14ff.

in mind, though a few passages, which Jeremias[43] seems to me to have thrown into disproportionate significance, would seem to indicate a tradition that the kings believed the gods had begotten them physically. The spirit of Babylonian royalty is beautifully summarized in the following statement of Neriglissar:

> Since Marduk, the lord of the gods, the prince, he who pronounces sentence, the spokesman, who knows altogether the heart of Igigi, since Marduk from among the numerous subjects found me out, has held me from my youth in the right way, has named me with a good name, has led me to the state of salvation and life; and since I have given heed to his power for the prosperity of my head and to my humility before his godhead, in that I took heed daily to do well toward him; therefore he found me out and called me to the kingdom in the land with a favorable name; for the eternal shepherding of his people he granted my kingship a just scepter which made great the land; he promised for my rulership a just ruler's staff to guarantee salvation to the people; he put into my hand a scourge with which to bend the enemy; he set an enduring crown upon me for my kingship. Rivals and rebels I put to nought, enemies I crushed, opponents and the disobedient I altogether consumed. I set up justice in the land. I ruled my widely outspread peoples in safety.[44]

The *νόμος ἔμψυχος* conception appears again when the king is described as the active command of the great gods, the executor of every commission.[45] The Babylonian words plainly imply, though less philosophically than the Greek phrase, that the king was the incarnation of the god's commands, their personalized and active form. And that this kingship was in Babylonia, as in the Hellenistic world, conceived in sun symbolism is strikingly brought out in the prayer of Nabonidus to Shamash the sun god, the god of law, who had long ago given the code to Hammurabi:

> May the gods Right, Justice, and Judgement, who are enthroned before thee, prepare at thy exalted and unchangeable command, at the

[43] "Die Vergöttlichung der babylonisch-assyrischen Könige", in *Der alte Orient*, 1919.

[44] Langdon, *op. cit.*, p. 214, lines 15ff.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 252, 6, line 8.

> inflexible order of thy great godhead, the way of peace and justice for my feet! . . . Make the radiance of thy outstreaming light, the manifestation of rulership, the glory of kingship, to go by my side as I plunder the lands of my enemies.[46]

This gift of kingly power seems to have often come in dreams.[47]

The chief purpose of this essay is to show that the same conception of kingly rule is that which lies also behind the Hebrew state. By way of transition it is interesting that two passages in Isaiah show that the Israelites were familiar with all the detailed aspects of Assyrian royalty which I have been discussing.

Isaiah 10 5–19 is a passage of rebuke of the King of Assyria for his pretensions. He is described as extremely haughty, with a royal glory of high looks, a way of describing royal haughtiness which arose apparently from the kingly appearance of oriental kings, and which became a by-word among Jews.[48] He has not recognized that he ruled by Yahveh's grant of power, and will accordingly be cut down by Yahveh's sending down upon him the true divine glory, before which his own human glory will wither.[49] That is, as a follower of Yahveh, Isaiah can understand kingship only as coming as a gift of royal glory from Yahveh. The king of Assyria is thus a usurper of royal prerogatives, since he has not this unique gift of ruling power. He will be overthrown like all usurpers, according to this theory, when his pitiful incompetence is exposed to the brilliance of true divine glory. Yahveh is substituted for Marduk and Nabu, as in the Persian passage already discussed, but the conception of kingship reflects exactly that of Babylonia.

Similarly in Isaiah 14 12–15 the Assyrian is rebuked as day star, son of the sun, his royal titles used in sarcasm. He has

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 260, lines 29ff., 39ff.

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 218, lines 16ff.; p. 278, vi, lines 12ff.

[48] Ps. 18 28; 131 1; Prov. 21 4 (here a figure of the pretensions of the king, see verse 1.)

[49] Marti thinks that verse 15 is a late gloss, and 16–19 are post-Isaian. But the conception of kingship is consistent throughout the passage as it now stands.

tried to become a *roi soleil* by rising above the constellations of the stars and becoming equal to the Most High. So, like Icarus, he will be overthrown for his presumption and cast down into Sheol. The description of the Assyrian king seems made by one quite familiar with the Assyrian royal office.[50]

The question is bound to arise as to how far we can draw conclusions for the actual nature of kingly rule from this courtly eloquence. I shall return to this subject again, and shall only state here that on the whole I think the eloquence is a safe guide, particularly when checked by those negative descriptions of the bad king, who was represented as a failure because he failed to live up to these courtly standards. The phrases themselves often reflect very primitive times, and may not have been taken seriously by many of the kings to whom they were applied. But their persistent continuance and the widespread adoption of them by other peoples argues that they were of great service in strengthening the authority of the ruler, and were of such service precisely because they were generally accepted as being true. On the Babylonian material I can not stop for a more extended discussion. My concern in this essay is to point out that similar conceptions were of the greatest importance in the early Hebrew view of society.

Hebrew elements of a philosophy of royal rule seem long to have antedated the actual royalty. Philo long since recognized that the Moses legend was written with royalty in mind. Moses was born of earthly parents, then entrusted to the Stream in a little basket, and rescued to be brought up in royalty; the story is so closely akin to Egyptian and Babylonian royal stories that it must have implied royalty to other minds than Philo's.[51] Weber says of a Babylonian parallel, the birth-legend of Sargon, that this is the typical form of the childhood myth of the ruler who

[50] The references to Babylonian kingship in Daniel, while of great importance, are so late as to have little value for showing any early Hebrew knowledge of Mesopotamian theories of kingship.

[51] Philo may have been echoing a traditional Jewish interpretation of Moses, which appears also in Is. 63 11. See Dürr, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

introduces a new age, or founds a new dynasty.[52] It was a story which always represented the relation of the ruler to the Stream, and showed how he became king as a result of this relationship. Moses' apprenticeship as a shepherd seemed also highly significant to Philo.

There are a few more specific passages on the royal prerogatives of Moses. In Exodus 18 13—27 Moses is represented as the judge-ruler of Israel who is so oppressed by the duty of hearing all the cases brought before him that he is at the point of a physical collapse. Jethro, his father-in-law, grasps the situation and suggests the appointment of a regular system of judges for the people, in which Moses will still hear the most important cases, but will be relieved of the great mass of minor ones. Moses is the sole source of law for the people. As he explains to Jethro, "The people come to me to inquire of God: when they have a matter, they come unto me; and I judge between a man and his neighbor, and I make them know the statutes of God, and his laws." Even though this fragment originally stood in the E source after that source's account of the giving of the law to Moses, as Holzinger suggests (a conclusion which I see no reason for drawing), at least God's law is represented as having been revealed only to Moses; the people are still in complete ignorance of it, and they regard an appeal to him as an appeal to God himself. Moses brings the law of God, which he has within himself, or to which he alone has access, to bear upon particular decisions, but the point is that he alone knows that law. The similarity to the *νόμος ἔμψυχος* conception of the hellenistic documents, and to Babylonian ideas, is complete. The basis of Moses' rule, as Philo pointed out, is that Moses is the *νόμος ἔμψυχος*, and Philo seems to have understood the intent of the passage better than the later scholars. To relieve Moses of his burden of judging, Jethro proposes that Moses teach all the people the laws of God and then appoint a system of judges who, in the light of Moses' legislation, will be able to judge all ordinary cases. But still Moses' relation to the law of

[52] Otto Weber, *Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrer*, p. 206.

God will be unique, because he alone has immediate access to it. He is to "be for the people to Godward, and bring the causes unto God." This but gives the rest of the function of a royal νόμος ἔμψυχος. The ruler is not only to have immediate relation with divine law; he is to interpret that law in statutes for the people which can be used in ordinary courts. The foundation of society is in the fact that the ruler is above his statutes as the living representative of divine law, so that in him the justice of God is always accessible to men. Indeed this passage is the most direct and simple description of the practical workings of the conception I have yet found anywhere, and is certainly important not alone in itself, but as it throws light upon all pre-monarchical government in Israel.

Numbers 11 11—25 is an equally important passage for the light it throws upon the conception of rulership. Here Moses is burdened by the cry of the people in the desert for food and goes to God to say his single responsibility for them is more than he can bear. He must have help in the form of co-rulers. Yahveh answers him that he is to select seventy elders of Israel and bring them into the tabernacle. "And I will come down and talk with thee: and I will take of the Spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them; and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone." Moses has been the sole ruler of the people by virtue of his being the sole possessor of the Spirit (of Yahveh). Now this rulership is to be shared, with Moses still at the top, by the fact that some of the Spirit which had been granted Moses is to be taken from him and given to the elders. It is not a gift of the Spirit direct from Yahveh: it is a transfer from Moses. So while Moses is left at the head of the state, the rulership and responsibility are not his alone, for others have a share in the divine spirit of rulership. Philo again showed that he correctly understood the nature of this transfer when he said that the Spirit that was on Moses was put on the others as fires are kindled from a fire without any loss to the first fire.[53] Rulership and the gift of the Spirit of Yahveh

[53] *De Gigant.*, 25.

are obviously synonymous terms. It is to be noticed that when these instructions were followed the immediate effect of the coming of the Spirit upon the elders was that each man began to prophesy. It is stated, if we may so interpret the puzzling last phrase of verse 25, that this stage of prophecy was only temporary, while, we assume, the gift of rulership was permanent. This connection of the gift of the spirit of rulership with prophecy should be borne in mind again when the case of Saul is considered.

In view of these passages Philo's interpretation of Moses as a king becomes highly important. To Philo the kingship of Moses was proved in the following facts: Moses had a peculiarly beautiful form;[54] he had been completely trained in science and magic;[55] he had early experience as a shepherd;[56] he was νόμος ἔμψυχος;[57] he had mystic power over the elements.[58] So "he was called god and king of the whole human race."[59] Indeed, in the fact that he is called the god of Pharaoh (Exod. 7 1) Philo saw in him an ideal king, quite in contrast to ordinary rulers whose claims to deity Philo did not, as a good Jew, in practice approve.[60] Philo's interpretation of the office of Moses in ancient Israel seems to be much nearer the intention of the E source than might have been supposed.[61] Of course neither E nor any other passage in the Pentateuch calls Moses king, but Philo is right in understanding the description of his office and power as intending to imply royal prerogatives.

When the JE material in Joshua and Judges is analysed the same view of the nature of the ruler and rulership appears. Joshua is the direct successor of Moses in office because he was his successor in his relation to Yahveh. "Yahveh said to Joshua, This

[54] *Vit. Mos.* I, 9.

[55] *Ibid.*, I, 23ff. Cf. *De Special. Legg.* III, 100, where Philo says that no Persian could be made king who was not a regularly trained magician.

[56] *Ibid.*, I, 60ff.

[57] *Ibid.*, I, 162.

[58] *Ibid.*, I, 155.

[59] *Ibid.*, I, 158.

[60] *SS. Ab. et Cain.* 9.

[61] See *Spec. Legg.* IV, 173ff.

day will I begin to magnify thee in the sight of all Israel, that they may know that, as I was with Moses, so will I be with thee" (Josh. 3 7). The very name of Joshua suggests one of his functions as divinely endowed ruler. Hitherto the saving of Israel had been the direct act of Yahveh, as in Exodus 14 30, where Yahveh's saving act in destroying the Egyptians brought honor to himself and his servant Moses. Now the ruler himself is called Preserver or Saviour. Joshua justified his name especially as a victor in war, an activity in which he was of course supported by Yahveh (Josh. 6 27). But the judgement of Joshua upon Achan (7 6ff.) shows that Joshua also acted as Yahveh's representative in judicial decisions.

In the account of the judges who followed Joshua the meaning of rulership is much more clear. All Israel was in hopeless disorder and defeat except in such times as God raised up a judge-ruler. Othniel, the first such ruler, is typical of them all. When the Israelites cried unto Yahveh, Yahveh raised up a saviour for them, who, endowed with the Spirit of Yahveh, was not only victor in war but the ruler in time of peace (Judges 3 9—11). Ehud (verse 15) is another such saviour. Of Gideon it is said that the spirit of Yahveh clothed itself with Gideon who thereupon became the saviour of Israel, or the agent through whom Yahveh saved Israel, while the army used the oriental form of royal battle-cry, "For Yahveh and Gideon." Mention is not made that Gideon was the judge-ruler, though it is to be assumed. Gideon (Judges 8 22ff.) does definitely reject the kingly office, on the ground that Yahveh was the only true king. There is thus an essential difference between this early conception of the spirit-filled judge-ruler and the full king. The difference would seem, to anticipate the kingly office, that while the judge-ruler is described in royal language throughout, he lacks any claim to personal preeminence. That is, the royal characteristics of personal beauty, personal virtue, personal supremacy are not found in the earlier officers. Even the strength of Samson is not his own, but is a gift of the spirit. The judges rule simply as God's agents, and their dignity seems not to have involved the overshadowing of their subjects

with their personal manifestations of royalty. The contrast is brought out in the story of Abimelech, Gideon's son, who was a usurper, without God's spirit, and who succeeded to his father's preeminence by killing his seventy brothers. Abimelech went through the oriental form of having himself anointed king, a practise which is familiar in Egypt and Canaan.[62] For the ceremony he was taken to the site of Yahveh's shrine, a pillar-stone under a sacred oak tree (9 6). The association of a tree or pillar with the royal office is also recurrent in Israelitic tradition, as will shortly appear. I have not been able to find its origin.[63] Jotham rebukes this usurper, and tells the parable of the trees who want a king (verses 8ff.). All the noble and useful trees of the forest refuse to abandon their proper work to take on waving over other trees as their function in life. Only the bramble is willing to be anointed king, and that on the definite understanding that if his subjects do not completely subordinate themselves to him he will destroy them. The meaning of kingship as a personal exaltation is perfectly clear. That Abimelech is regarded by God and men as a usurper is shown by the fact that he does not have the gift of the spirit, and quickly comes to an ignoble end. He is killed by a woman who drops a mill-stone upon his head from an upper window.

After him comes Tola, a saviour judge (10 1, 2), then Jair, who is simply called judge (10 3). That the meaning of the office is not changed is shown by Jephthah who is anointed by the spirit to be the conqueror of the Ammonites (the word saviour does not happen to appear), and who judges Israel six years (11 29; 12 7). Samson is again frequently endowed by the spirit to conquer

[62] See Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, "Anointing"; Bertholet, *History of Hebrew Civilization*, p. 113.

[63] A parallel which may have had some real prehistoric connection is the early association of the prince's goddess in Minoan-Mycenaean religion with both the tree (oak) and the pillar. She is the goddess who became the Greek Athena. See Nilsson, *History of Greek Religion*, pp. 17, 26f. The oak had similar associations with Artemis, and was dear to royalty as such. Cook, *Zeus*, II, 400ff., esp. 418f.

and be saviour (13 5, 25; 14 6, 19; 15 14), and he also judges Israel twenty years (15 20; 16 31). When he breaks his covenant with Yahveh by cutting his hair, Yahveh, or the spirit, departs from him, and he is reduced to impotence (16 20).

The judge-ruler-saviour, then, is a conception of rulership in which the person of the judge is the least of his claims to his sovereignty, and which does not elevate the incumbent to any place of personal social preeminence. He rules and saves as the mouthpiece and instrument of Yahveh, and his only personal contribution is his loyalty to Yahveh. But though the judge does not become a unique person in his social prerogatives, his office is identical with royalty in every other respect. Under both forms of rulership it is recognized that safety and order for society are dependent upon the state's being ruled by a person divinely empowered to mediate the rulership of God to men, particularly in matters of war and the making and administering of law. That is, the judge-ruler was essentially the νόμος ἔμψυχος.

At the opening of the book of Samuel, Samuel is described as a judge who like his predecessors is inspired by Yahveh and judges Israel (3 19; 7 15ff.), and who is a seer or prophet (9 9), who yet grieves all Israel by lacking the other primary function of a judge in not being their saviour against their enemies. It is because this all-important aspect of rulership has failed them that the people demand a king who will be their saviour-captain as well as their judge (8 5, 20; 9 15). Samuel warns the people, quite in the spirit of Jotham's parable, that a king will demand such subordination of the people to his own person as they have never known and will bitterly resent (8 10—17).[64] Yahveh can not be their king in the old sense at all if the person of a human king rises between him and his people. But the people insist, and the royal office is accordingly instituted. Samuel is led by Yahveh to choose Saul for the office, a man from the more wealthy classes

[64] Gunkel suggests that this means that the royal office was an importation from Gentile practices. "Die Königspsalmen", in *Preussische Jahrbücher* CLVIII (1914), p. 52.

(9 1, 2), marked for his physical superiority in beauty and strength.[65] Furthermore, in spite of Yahveh's initial reluctance, as described in the E source, the JE editor preserved the J point of view also, that Yahveh is going to grant Israel a king because he has such pity upon the people (9 15). As the account reaches us as a whole, then, the foundation of the royal office is definitely made an act of Yahweh, though whether he thought the step wise or not is answered in different ways. It may be noted in passing that the two traditions would seem to represent two genuinely different political philosophies. One tradition saw in the old system of judges the ideal government; the other was anxious to institute a royal office. A record of the latter is preserved in a sort of refrain that appears four times in the book of Judges (17 6; 18 1; 19 1; 21 25): "In those days there was no king in Israel; every man did that which was right in his own eyes." The author of this statement had no sympathy with the judge as the link between Yahveh's rule and the people; he saw such a link only in the person of a king, and like the Persians he felt that "no king, no law" was the rule because the king was the unique source of law for a people. That is, this most important obverse statement of the νόμος ἔμψυχος theory of kingship appears very early in the literature of the Hebrews.[66]

To return to the founding of the monarchy. When Samuel met Saul he had him to dinner, and gave him with great solemnity a certain portion of the sheep, though just what the portion was is not clear. Budde says that it is generally agreed that it was the fatty tail, and that this section was reserved for offering to deity. Whatever the portion, it is obvious that its being given to Saul was a remarkable distinction, as symbolizing that he alone among men might eat the parts of animals usually reserved for deity. The next day the anointing was enacted, and Samuel kissed Saul (10 1ff.). But there were other important preludes

[65] His height seems at this point an addition by the JE editor from the E source; 10 23.

[66] Just how early the statement is is not known. Critics disagree as to whether it should be regarded as pre- or post-exilic.

to his being made king foretold and carried out. A very late editor adds at this point the important royal idea that Yahveh gave Saul another heart (10 9). The older accounts tell how, at the oak of Tabor, a tree of royal association, Saul was to meet three men carrying three kids, bread and wine, who would give him two loaves of bread, which he was to take, and, presumably, eat. Apparently this was to represent the divine nourishment of kings which we have met in Babylonia, and which would seem to indicate an ancient survival, that Saul was to get royal divine power from the deity of the oak.[67] Soon after this event he would meet a band of prophets among whom he would at last be given the spirit, the immediate result of which would be that, like the elders of Moses, he would temporarily become a prophet. Samuel's prophecies were all fulfilled, and Saul received the loaves and the spirit. The E source, which seems to have had a different order of events, now is inserted to tell how Saul was selected. According to this story the people gathered to have the king selected by lot of Yahveh, and when he was selected he was, as in the J account, distinguished physically, here specifically by his height, from all the other Hebrews (10 17ff.). This story of the selection of Saul is harmonized with the J account by an editor who represents all the people, including Saul, as returning to their homes after the lot was completed, though the E account must have gone on to describe his being made king at once. The J narrative now is resumed (chapter 11), and tells how Saul arose from his obscurity as the spirit-filled Saviour, attracting the attention of the people by his prowess in arms against the Ammonites, as a result of which they took him to Gilgal and formally made him king. The reason for the selection of Gilgal is obscure. I can only make the suggestion that the twelve stones which Joshua had piled up there after the crossing of the Jordan (Joshua 4 20) may have been in the form of a pillar or column, and that here is another association of the king with a pillar. The explanation of the origin of this pillar is of course late, but it is obviously a late explanation

[67] See J. G. Frazer, *Folklore in the Old Testament* III, p. 56; also *Lectures on the early history of the Kingship*, by the same author, pp. 198ff.

of a very old and much revered pile of stones. In the account of the formalities at Gilgal a late addition represents some of the people as doubting that Saul was the saviour when he was first popularly acclaimed as such. After the victory of Saul over the Ammonites had demonstrated his right to the title as a military commander, Saul was given opportunity by their skepticism of showing the other chief kingly quality by being merciful and refusing to have the doubters put to death (10 27; 11 12, 13). The object of this insertion would seem to me to be to make Saul's claim to kingship include judicial justice and mercy, as well as prowess in war.

Another later addition recounts that Samuel wrote a book describing the nature of this new kingly rule and presented it to Yahveh (10 25). If such a book ever existed, its loss is greatly to be deplored. In its place there is an E description of Samuel addressing the people on the same subject (12 6ff.). In this speech Samuel abdicates his office as judge. No longer is Yahveh to be the king of Israel ruling through a man who acts impersonally as Yahveh's mouth-piece. Samuel points out that the people have sinned greatly in asking for the change which will inject human personality into the rulership. Still Yahveh will tolerate the new order, and continue to bless the people on the sole condition that the king continue the old judgeship at least in this, that he is always obedient to the voice or guidance of Yahveh (verses 12ff.). (The obedience to Yahveh's commandments which is added seems to be a Deuteronomic insertion.) That is, the true king may be personally magnified to the distaste of Yahveh, but he must still, like the judge, be the spirit-filled and spirit-led link between Yahveh and his people.

This conception of the royal office, which is in all points in agreement with the oriental monarchy, is the criterion consistently applied to royalty thereafter. Saul's reign was one of constant warfare against the Philistines (14 52), and at the end his household fell, and the kingship was given to another house. This is explained twice, though both the J and the E accounts have the same ultimate reason in mind, namely that Saul fell because he did not

obey Yahveh's commands, that is he failed to fulfill his part of the bargain. In the J source (chapter 13), though possibly from a later editor, the fault of Saul began at the episode of his induction into office at Gilgal. For according to this account Samuel had made an appointment at the close of his first interview with Saul to meet him seven days later at Gilgal for the ceremony (10 8). When the appointed time came, however, Samuel was late, though Saul was there with all the people. It is clear that this account knew nothing of the victory of Saul over the Ammonites, and that Saul and the people were only completing the ceremony begun at the casting of the lots. While they were waiting the Philistines threatened to attack the gathering, and since Saul was untried in arms he feared the people would have no confidence in him and disperse. So Saul did not dare delay the ceremony, and proceeded to offer sacrifice himself to Yahveh. Samuel arrived shortly afterwards and was aghast at Saul's presumption. It had been clearly told Saul that the sacrifice was to be offered by Samuel, and apparently, as Saul was not yet king, it was sacrilegious for him to make the sacrifice himself. Samuel rebuked Saul bitterly for his failure to follow Yahveh's instructions as he had had them from Samuel, and told him that he had lost the kingly relationship with Yahveh by his disobedience; Yahveh already had another man in mind for the office. The real nature of Saul's sin would seem to be that in offering the sacrifices himself, the ceremony in which he was being united with or adopted by Yahveh, he had reversed the proper order or initiative. Samuel acting for Yahveh should have done the act, for then Yahveh would be taking the initiative toward Saul. But when Saul himself took the initiative, it really meant that he was forcing himself upon Yahweh, and it was this that Yahweh resented. The purpose of the account is clearly to show that Saul's rule was a failure from the beginning because he was not Yahveh's obedient instrument.

The E source puts the disobedience much later in Saul's career, when Samuel comes to him to command in Yahveh's name that he attack and utterly destroy the Amalekites (15 1ff.). Saul did

what we would call a thorough piece of work in obedience to this command, but saved the king, Agag, and the spoil instead of annihilating everything in the land. At this Yahveh grew angry, and told Samuel that he was sorry he had made Saul king. Samuel then brought the dire message to Saul: Yahveh had rejected him from being king.

Whatever the incident of the disobedience, the J account summarizes the ancient opinion of its result in saying that the spirit of Yahveh departed from Saul (16 14). From this time on Saul's kingdom was subject to increasing marauding from the Philistines, and to consequent internal disorder and suffering, until Saul came to a wretched end. Yet even to the end his person, as the anointed of Yahveh, was sacred and must not be touched (26 9, 11).

The story of David is even more complicated than Saul's, but need not be analysed in detail. A very late Midrash insertion in the older material tells as the immediate sequel of the second account of Yahveh's renouncing Saul that Samuel under Yahveh's direction went forthwith to Bethlehem to anoint David, and brings out David's personal beauty as his distinguishing characteristic (16 1—13). The older accounts only tell of his being a shepherd who by feats of prowess came to be regarded more highly than Saul by the people; he behaved himself wisely, and Yahveh, who had departed from Saul, was with him, a term synonymous with his having the spirit of Yahveh, while his name came to be greatly set by (18 5, 12, 14, 15, 30). But David did get hold of the royal symbols, even while Saul was jealously trying to kill him. There are two versions of this feat. The E source (chapter 24) tells how David found Saul in a cave at Engedi and got a piece of his royal robe. The J source (26 11ff.) in a similar scene at Ziph has David get the royal spear (cf. 22 6), and Saul's jug of water, which latter may have symbolized the divine Stream we have so frequently met, and will meet again. The meaning in both scenes is the same.

When Saul finally was dead his crown and bracelet were taken from the corpse and brought to David (II Sam. 1 10). Ber-

tholet[68] says, without stating his reasons, that this passage is perhaps not in all points historical, though I can not see why he should accept it as evidence that Saul's regalia included the bracelet, while he rejects it as evidence that he wore a crown or diadem.

The bracelet (probably read הַצְּעָדָה for אֶצְעָדָה), which must also have been mentioned as part of the regalia in II Kings 11 12 (reading here the plural הַצְּעָדוֹת with Codices A and B of the Septuagint for the meaningless הָעֵדוּת), is highly important in view of the royal bracelet of the Assyrians and Babylonians. In Babylonia the king's bracelet always had a definite ornament, a solar rosette, and in all pictorial representations both bracelet and rosette are brought out in an exaggerated detail which shows the great importance of the insignia. Its significance still remains to be investigated, so far as I can ascertain. From my own observation I should judge that it indicated primarily the *νόμος ἔμψυχος* aspect of kingship.[69] The bracelet is worn by the solar deity in act of giving the laws to Hammurabi. It appears on a most interesting scepter at Yale which has at the end of a square bronze shaft a hand, with just enough of the wrist to include the bracelet; since the scepter was the symbol of the judicial authority of royalty, this distinguishing mark would appear to have significance in that connection. Though ordinary bracelets are common in all reliefs, this specially marked bracelet appears on no one but kings, queens, and deities, except on a few representations of high officials carrying a staff, in which case both the official and the staff are marked with the rosette.[70] This specially marked

[68] *History of Hebrew Civilization*, p. 245, n. 10. He refers to II Sam. 12 30, where David takes the crown (עֲטָרָה) from the head of the king of Rabbah and puts it on his own head, and says that this is probably the first use of the crown by Hebrew royalty. This act had nothing to do with David's Israelitish kingship, but symbolized his annexation of rule over Rabbah.

[69] The rosette also appears on the shoulder of early kings. See Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p. 14; and Kampers, *Vom Werdegange der abendländischen Kaisermystik*, pp. 14ff.; also my *Political Philosophy of Hellenistic Kingship*, p. 93. This custom seems to lie behind the famous phrase: "And the rulership shall be upon his shoulder," Is. 9 6.

[70] As in the relief in the Yale Art Museum. So far as I can ascertain the

official would appear to have been a judge, who was acting as viceroy in judicial matters.

That the bracelet should appear also thus early in Israel along with the crown as a mark of royalty seems to me at least highly suggestive, and though there are no data to justify assuming that the Hebrew royal bracelet had the Babylonian design or meaning, it is at least a possibility that such was the case in view of the other detailed similarities in the conceptions of royalty in the two places.

The record of the reign of David is largely preoccupied with his wars and conquests, but a few passages show that his royalty consisted in more than his being the military saviour under Yahveh. That his military conquests were recognized as the work of Yahveh is shown particularly in II Samuel 5 12: "And David perceived that Yahveh had established him king over Israel, and that he had exalted his kingdom for his people Israel's sake." That his rule was that of a shepherd, and that his originally having been a shepherd had significance from early times is shown in the E statement of Yahveh (II Sam. 7 8): "I took thee from the sheepcote, from following the sheep, that thou shouldest be prince over my people, over Israel; and I have been with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies from before thee; and I will make thee a great name, like unto the name of the great ones that are in the earth." There follows a promise that David's house will be a permanent dynasty. His rule was also characterized by its justice and righteousness for all the people (8 15), as particularly illustrated in his restoring the outcast Mephibosheth, son of Saul (chapter 9). The impression his judicial

only exception is the relief of the Turtan, or Commander in Chief, with Sargon, British Museum 118822, published by H. R. Hall, *Babylonian and Assyrian Sculpture in the British Museum*, Plate XXVII. Here the Turtan, as well as Sargon, wears the royal bracelet. This may indicate that the rosette, while it was certainly the mark of the divine royal lawgiver, also symbolized the king as the military Saviour, in which capacity the Turtan was acting as viceroy. Is not the fact that the Turtan has this unusual distinction the whole meaning of the relief?

integrity made upon the people is expressed in the words of the wise woman of Tekoa: "As a messenger of God so is my lord the king to discern good and bad . . . My lord is wise according to the wisdom of a messenger of God, to know all things that are on the earth" (14 17, 20). Bertholet[71] calls this meaningless flattery, but I do not think he is right, for since the woman who uttered the words is characterized by the J writer as being wise, it would appear that he approved her manner of speech. The former of the two statements marks David as having divine knowledge of good and bad, that is in judicial decisions, and is apparently a reference to David as νόμος ἔμψυχος. The latter phrase is most clearly explicable as a recognition in David of a divine magical understanding of nature, also an oriental royal prerogative.[72] Bertholet is quite right in thinking that this does not imply that the woman regarded David as himself a deity, for the language specifically describes him as being only endowed with the divine gifts. At the same time the nature of the gifts and the seriousness with which the source treats the incident indicate strongly that royalty was conceived at the time in those terms. Indeed the same expression recurs in Mephibosheth's speech to David: "And he hath slandered thy servant unto my lord the king; but my lord the king is as a messenger of God: do therefore what is good in thine eyes" (II Sam. 19 27). That is, my accusers have slandered me in their accusations, but you, the king, as a representative of deity may be trusted to make the correct judicial decision.[73]

The strength of the association of the royal office with judicial decision is strikingly illustrated in Absalom's attempt to usurp his father's prerogatives (II Sam. 15 1–6). Two of his methods are indicated: first he imitated his father's pomp; second he stole the hearts of the people by meeting them at the gate on the way

[71] *History of Hebrew Civilization*, p. 244.

[72] See above, note 55.

[73] Cf. Job 33 23, where it is said of a king, "If there be with him a messenger, and interpreter, one among a thousand, to show unto man what is right for him."

to David's judgement seat and settling their disputes there so that they had no need of David, and sympathized with Absalom when he began to say: "Oh that I were made judge in the land, that every man who had any suit or cause might come unto me, and I would do him justice." When again it is recalled that the office of judge included that of making law, the importance of this section is obvious. The judge at this time had no elaborate code of law to go by, and had, as in Solomon's decision later, frequently to invent his procedure as well as his criteria for judging. The king had personally to be the law code, or source of law, for his people.

The most striking passage for our purpose in connection with David is the very old psalm (II Sam. 23 1–7) recorded as David's last words. Without being quite so credulous as to say with Gunkel[74] that this ascription is undoubtedly genuine, it is almost certain that the psalm is preexilic, and reflects the ideas of the period we are examining.

> David the son of Jesse saith,
> And the man who was raised on high saith,
> The anointed of the God of Jacob,
> And the sweet psalmist of Israel:
> 'The Spirit of Yahveh spake by me,
> And his word was upon my tongue.
> The God of Israel said,
> The Rock of Israel spake to me:
> One that ruleth over men righteously,
> That ruleth in the fear of God,
> He shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth,
> A morning without clouds,
> When the tender grass springeth out of the earth,
> Through clear shining after rain.'

The king elements here are of the greatest importance. David is described as the one who was exalted or lifted up, and the anointed of God. As king he had a special relation to the Spirit of Yahveh, for the Spirit spoke by or through David, and this speaking was definitely an expression of Yahveh's righteous rule

[74] "Die Königspsalmen" in *Preussische Jahrbücher* CLVIII (1914), p. 66.

of men. That is, by David's peculiar relation to the Spirit his words were the righteous utterances of the Spirit. Such a person became the righteous ruler of his people, and at the same time was, like the sun, a source of illumination for the people and the land. So David was the incarnate Spirit of Yahveh to carry out Yahveh's work of justly ruling the people. The νόμος ἔμψυχος motif is unmistakable. But not only so: as such an incarnation David was comparable to the light of the sun when it rises. Although the statement is obscure as we have it, there can be no question but that the comparison was originally quite explicit, and made clear that the ruler's power was thought of as a solar Stream.

When David's reign neared its end, the question of his successor, which had been raised frequently during his lifetime, became urgent. It was impossible, with a large number of sons, to wait to select the successor until after David's death, since there was no recognized principle of succession. So David himself appointed Solomon, had him anointed king by Zadok the priest and prophet, and Solomon ascended the throne (I Kings 1 32—39). This story is part of the oldest material in Kings, together with the statement that the kingdom came to Solomon from Yahveh (2 15, 24). However, formally being anointed and coming to the throne was not enough. There had also to be the direct act of consecration by Yahveh's giving the royal character. The story of this gift, one of the most important passages in the Old Testament for our purpose, also belongs to the oldest material in the book of Kings. Solomon was at Gibeon sacrificing at the high place there (I Kings 3 4—13; cf. II Chron. 1 7—13), when one night, like the oriental kings, he was given by Yahveh the royal character in a dream. Yahveh appeared to him to bid him ask what gift he would like. Solomon says that he recognizes the true nature of the ruling office. David had been prospered as king, and given the supreme blessing of having his son succeed him, "according as he walked before thee in truth, and in righteousness, and in uprightness of heart with thee." But now, presented with the great responsibility of rulership, Solomon feels himself a little child; his greatest need is a

"hearing heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and evil; for who is able to judge this thy great people?" This לֵב שֹׁמֵעַ לִשְׁפֹּט is the earliest tradition of the wisdom of Solomon. It is a gift of God, like the gift to the kings in Babylon, of a special power of hearing to guide him in his acts of legislating and judging. There can be no question but that what he is to hear is the guiding voice of Yahveh. That is, Solomon is given a special faculty, the power of perceiving the will or law of Yahveh to use in giving and administering law to his people. It is on this faculty that the subsequent greatness of his rulership rested. The expression may be taken as another Hebrew counterpart of the *νόμος ἔμψυχος*. It is not a new conception. Success in rulership in Israel from earliest times has clearly been regarded as resting on the ruler's having the same faculty. This passage is of such great importance because it makes the earlier implications explicit. Yahveh is, according to the story, delighted at Solomon's request. Since the king has asked for the essential aspect of rulership, Yahveh will also give its other and external aspects, honor and riches. We are probably safe in taking this as all typical of the ideal king. The honor and riches of the king flowed from his having the hearing ear or heart, and were impossible otherwise.

A slightly later source goes on to give the famous judgement of Solomon on the child disputed by the two harlots, a story which is variously told throughout the Orient. The purpose of telling the story here is clear from verse 28: "And all Israel heard of the judgment which the king had judged; and they feared the king: for they saw that the wisdom of God was in him *to do justice*."

A still later tradition, but apparently pre-Deuteronomic, tells the story of the visit of the Queen of Sheba (I Kings 10 1—10; cf. II Chron. 9 1—12). Here, as Benzinger points out (*ad loc.*), the story is again told to glorify Solomon's wisdom, but in this case the wisdom seems to be the power of answering questions, probably riddles, of all sorts. Yet the older conception reappears in her praise of him: "Blessed be Yahveh thy God, who delighted in thee, to set thee on the throne of Israel: because Yahveh loved

Israel for ever, therefore made he thee king, to act as the legislator-judge, and to do righteousness." Whatever the subject[75] of the earlier riddles, then, Solomon's wisdom was such as to fit him to carry on the legal aspects of his office with integrity, while the same source repeats that this wisdom is an entity which has been put into Solomon's heart (verse 24).

The story of the fall of Solomon (I Kings 11 1—13) as resulting from his displeasing Yahveh in setting up shrines for the gods of his wives is full of difficulties which make the passage of no value here. We have lost Yahveh's original rebuke of Solomon, and a Deuteronomic rebuke has been put in its place. Probably the phrase "because his heart was turned away from Yahveh, the God of Israel" (verse 9, cf. 4) is part of the original, since it is in perfect accord with the founding of the kingship in Solomon's heart.

For the royal symbolism that was retained after Solomon we are fortunate in having the splendid description of the crowning of Joash (II Kings 11 5 ff.; cf. II Chron. 23 3 ff.). Joash, the last remaining son of Ahaziah, was saved by stealth from the general massacre of heirs to the throne conducted by his mother Athaliah. He grew up in hiding and was crowned king as a result of a popular movement which wanted to be rid of Athaliah's tyranny. By instruction of Yahveh to Jehoiada the priest, Joash was taken to the temple concealed in the midst of a large body of soldiers.[76] There he was met by Jehoiada who "brought out the king's son and put the crown upon him and gave him the bracelet,[77] and they made him king and anointed him; and they clapped their hands and said, Long live the king." Hearing the shouting, Athaliah came to the temple, "and she looked and behold the king stood by the pillar as the manner was, and the captains and trumpets by the king." She was killed amidst popular rejoicing, and the city became quiet.

[75] A late Midrash insertion (I Kings 4 29–34) represents Solomon's wisdom as being the royal magical knowledge of nature.

[76] Chronicles has rewritten this to make the soldiers Levites.

[77] On the bracelet, see above.

The early symbolism has all been carried through to represent the king's rulership. He is chosen and anointed at the command of Yahveh, the crown and bracelet are the chief tokens of his office, while (like Josiah later in 23 3) the public evidence of his rulership is his standing by the pillar. The result of the overthrowing of the usurper and the establishment of a true king on the throne is the restoration of tranquillity to the people.

Throughout the account of the various kings of Israel and Judah, when the author has not the distinctive approach of Deuteronomy to the subject, the old assumptions of the true nature of royal rule persist. The king is the link between Yahveh and his people so long as his heart is perfect with Yahveh (I Kings 15 3, 14). David has become the ideal ruler (11 4; 15 5) whose heart, except in the matter of Uriah, never turned away. Or the formula may appear as in the case of Hezekiah: "He did that which was right in the eyes of Yahveh, according to all that David his father had done . . . For he clave to Yahveh; he departed not from following him" (II Kings 18 3, 6).[78] The assumption is that Yahveh is judging his people according to the conduct of the king. A righteous king in proper relationship with Yahveh implies a prosperous and victorious period for all, while if the king is not true to Yahveh all the people suffer for his fault. Illustrations need not be multiplied. The cases of Jehu and Hezekiah are sufficient to show the assumptions of the entire history of the period. "Like king, like people." The king's disposition colored his entire realm, which rose and fell with him. Isaiah clearly expresses the current philosophy on this point. Jerusalem, he says (1 21—27; cf. 10 1—4), used to be full of justice, but now the princes are rebellious, taking bribes and withholding justice from the fatherless and widows. Therefore comes the wrath of Yahveh. The time of restoration, in turn, will begin

[78] Verse 6b here seems to me a Deuteronomic gloss. In II Kings 12 2 King Jehoash gets his instructions from Yahveh through Jehoiada the priest, as Saul had done from Samuel. Benzinger (*ad. loc.*) thinks this passage comes from an old pre-Deuteronomic priestly source.

by Yahveh's setting up judges and counsellors as before, who will make the city into a city of righteousness.[79]

There is still another important body of material for the conception of kingship in preexilic Israel. In my opinion Gunkel and Kittel are entirely right in seeing the "King Psalms" of the Psalter not, as is usually done, as late idealizations, but as actual preexilic documents preserved from the ancient festivals of the birthday, or enthronement anniversary, of the king. An adequate analysis of these psalms is quite beyond the compass of the present essay, but their important elements for our purpose can be briefly indicated. Psalms 2, 20, 21, 101 are songs of triumph for the ruler's conquest in war. Psalm 18 seems to me to be post-Deuteronomic in its conception of the king (see verse 22 and below), though it has the important idea of the king as being drawn out of the stream (verse 16), and as being personally righteous (verses 20, 21). Psalms 45, 72 and 110 require closer examination. In the first of these the writer says he is moved to describe the king:

> Thou art the fairest of the children of men;
> Benevolence is poured upon thy lips:
> Therefore God hath blessed thee for ever.
> Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O mighty one,
> Thy glory and thy majesty.
> And in thy majesty ride on prosperously,
> In behalf of truth and meekness-righteousness:[80]
> And thy right hand will let thee see marvelous things.
>
> Thy throne, thou divine one, is for ever and ever:
> A sceptre of equity is the sceptre of thy kingdom.
> Thou hast loved righteousness and hated injustice:
> Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee
> With the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

Nearly all the now familiar aspects of kingliness are here. The king is preeminent for personal beauty, and therefore he has benevolence poured upon him, yet not poured upon him in general,

[79] On this aspect of royal rule see Mowinckel, "Psalmenstudien II", in *Skrifter utgift av Videnskapsselskapet I Kristiania*, 1921 (II. Hist.-Filos. Kl. Bd. II), p. 299 (publ. 1922); cf. Dürr, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

[80] So the Hebrew, but the text is certainly corrupt.

but poured in such a way as to affect his lips, by which the poet could only have meant that his commands and judgements are gracious. So he has a special divine blessing. He is to be a military champion, but even in this activity his motives are to be the protection of truth and righteousness. The throne of such a king will be eternal, and he himself is addressed as a divinity as he bears the righteous sceptre familiar from Mesopotamia. But he is not merely a recipient of kingly prerogatives, for he was anointed king precisely because he himself had a nature to love right and hate injustice. The antiquity of this poem seems to me completely vindicated by its calling the king a divinity,[81] an extraordinary statement in any period of Jewish history, but utterly impossible in later Judaism.

Psalm 72 is still more important for our purpose in that it is a prayer that Yahveh will in the fullest sense make the king *νόμος ἔμψυχος*.[82] Of the entire psalm, which is rich in symbolism, I will quote only the first four verses:

> Give the king thy justice,[83] O God,
> And thy righteousness to the king's son.
> He will judge thy people with righteousness,
> And thy poor with justice.
> The mountains shall bring peace to the people,
> And the hills righteousness.
> He will judge the poor of the people,
> He will save the children of the needy,
> And will break in pieces the oppressor.

If God will give the king his justice and legal knowledge and integrity then the king will be able to be the saviour judge of the people. Under the ideal king even nature will respond to the outpouring of his justice, and all nations will be subject to his preeminence. The continued refrain is that this ideal king will, like the ideal king of Babylonia, have special care for the rights

[81] Duhm, *ad loc.*, questions the text, thinking it impossible that a king could have been called אֱלֹהִים; but his argument seems very forced.

[82] Dürr, pp. 85f., recognizes this psalm as expressing the idea of the king as *Personifikation des Rechtes*; but he does not put the fact, as it appears to me, in the important position it deserves.

[83] Reading the singular with the LXX, Duhm, and Kittel.

of the poor and oppressed classes of the people. I agree entirely with Gunkel and Kittel that this, like Psalm 45, is an address to an actual king, and that the hope later expressed that he will have eternal life is no more a proof that it must refer to a Messianic figure than similar expressions from Babylonia and Egypt preclude their having been used with actual kings. For the aspirations for kings to live forever in those countries had no reference to the beliefs there in the life after death. "O King live forever" means "O King may you never die," and has no remote eschatological implication. It could as well have been found in the early environment of Israel as in a country which had belief in personal immortality. Inasmuch as the later Messianic expectations were in large part only the longing of the people of Israel for a truly ideal king of their own to restore the glories of their race, such utterances as this would have been preserved with Messianic interpretations. To me both Psalms 45 and 72 appear to be only such forms of addressing a ruler as the orient everywhere knew, and to be genuine survivals of the preexilic monarchy in full harmony with the conception of kingship revealed in the preexilic historical literature.

Psalm 110 is of equal interest:

Yahveh said to my lord, 'Sit at my right hand,
Until I make thine enemies thy footstool.'
Yahveh will send forth the sceptre of thy strength out of Zion:
Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.
Thy people follow thee willingly
In holy array on the day of thy military procession:
Out of the womb of the morning
Thou hast the dew of thy youth.
Yahveh hath sworn, and will not repent:
'Thou art a priest for ever
After the manner of Melchizedek.'
The Lord at thy right hand
Hath stricken through kings in the day of his wrath.
He will judge among the nations,
He will fill the places with corpses,
He will strike through the head in many countries.
He will drink of the Stream by the way:
Therefore will he lift up the head.

Here too, is a king at Yahveh's right hand whose royal adornment is the dew from the womb of the morning, that is, who is endowed with the proverbial solar power. He is priest and king, as were the early rulers of Israel, Moses, the judges, and the pre-Deuteronomic kings, who made the chief sacrifices as did all kings everywhere, and whose ancient prerogatives were preserved in the royal garb of the later high priesthood.[84] Verses 5—7 would not seem to have been part of the original psalm, because the person addressed is changed: hitherto "thou" has referred to the king; now it signifies Yahveh. The psalm seems to me to have been made by the joining at this point of two old king psalms. But the conception of the kingly office is the same in both parts of the psalm. In the second part the king is represented as judging his enemies in his wrath and crushing their royal heads; the king himself is nourished by the Stream, by drinking of which he is exalted, or in the familiar phrase from Babylon, his head is lifted up. In this psalm Kittel seems to me entirely correct in rejecting as mere coincidence the acrostic which was found in the early part of the psalm spelling out the word Simon. The psalm, like the others I have discussed, fits in perfectly with the spirit of the earlier kingship, and seems to me certainly to have originated in that time, and to be a very ancient festal hymn of the court.

That the kernel of the ancient conception of royalty was the *νόμος ἔμψυχος* theory is further illustrated by the evidence of the Deuteronomic material. Whenever this material is dated, whether at the end of the kingdom of Judah, or during or after the return from captivity, it marks the same essential change in the Hebrew religion. From a people immediately led by Yahveh and his inspired rulers and prophets the Jews have become the people of the Covenant. Their loyalty to Yahveh is tested hereafter by their fidelity in observing the commands of the revealed statutes. In ancient times the person of the inspired leader or ruler constituted Israel's covenant with God. As he led them

[84] Cf. Exod. 28 36ff.; 39 30ff. On the king of Israel as priest see Dürr's remarks, *op. cit.*, pp. 139ff., with the references given by him there to Gunkel, Kittel, and Mowinckel.

they went; as he obeyed and pleased Yahveh, they pleased Yahveh. But now, probably in the absence of such a νόμος ἔμψυχος, the covenant came to be a revealed and priest-guarded code. If my analysis of the nature of rulership in ancient Israel has been correct there should be some evidence of a transition, if not conflict, by which the new Covenant was adapted to the old political philosophy. Such evidence is abundantly at hand.

First in Deuteronomy itself (17 14–20) there is a section which clearly states the Deuteronomic theory of kingship. The king is certainly to be the choice of Yahveh and always a Jew (verse 15), and is not to make himself a magnificent pomp, harem, or treasury (verses 16f.). The most important point is that when he becomes king, in order that his life may be fully identified with God's law, he is not, as before, to become God's unique representative in law=making, but he is to copy out the law of the Levitical priesthood with his own hand, that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and that he keep the commandments in all strictness. So shall he prolong the life of himself and his dynasty. Philo quite correctly understood this passage as meaning that the object of copying the law was to get the law, not in the king's own handwriting, but into the king's own heart.[85] The idea that a true king was one whose heart was filled with God's law had to be adapted to the idea that God's law for his people was not his Spirit so much as the Code of the Levitical priesthood. The attempt at uniting the old with the new in a conception of rulership is obvious enough. It is the Code of which the king is to be the incarnation. And it was to carry out this conception of kingship that in passage after passage which we have been discussing there appear Deu-

[85] *De Specialibus Legibus* IV, 160ff. Philo represents the king as musing over his completed volume, after he has finished writing out the law with his own hand, and saying, "Why did I write it out? For no other reason but that by writing these things out I might copy them over into my soul, and stamp their divine and indelible characters upon my mind. Other kings indeed have staves for their sceptres, but my sceptre is the book of Deuteronomy, unrivalled for its glory and fame, a symbol of the irreproachable rulership which is copied after the archetype, the kingly rule of God."

teronomic glosses to interpret the loyalty of the king to Yahveh's spirit as loyalty to the Code.[86]

In dating king material the presence or absence of this later point of view is of great importance. For example Psalm 89 (like Psalm 18) is a king psalm, that is definitely post-Deuteronomic. Yahveh is described as the ideal king of righteousness and justice, the source of the people's salvation. To him also belongs the king, who is then described in ideal terms (verses 19—37). The true king is God's son, his anointed, as eternal in his, or his dynasty's, rulership as the sun and moon. But this is entirely dependent upon his keeping of the law and ordinances, statutes and commandments. So long as his family guards this covenant they will endure. The dynasty of David has perished, it is understood, precisely because it failed at this point. The psalm closes with a magnificent appeal to Yahveh to cease from wrath and restore the loving kindness he had promised to David. This sort of psalm is as typical of the post-Deuteronomic attitude toward society and the king as the formerly discussed psalms represented the primitive point of view; and the very force of the contrast between the two heightens my conviction that the others actually did come from preexilic Israel.

The relation of this view of the royal office to the Messianic expectation is something I shall not attempt to trace. Fortunately since the appearance of Dürr's book, to which reference has frequently been made, that subject is in general well illuminated.[87] My interest has been in political philosophy, and it would seem that the political philosophy of ancient Hebrew kingship has appeared with sufficient distinctness. The essence of the royal office was that the king was the νόμος ἔμψυχος, the incarnation of the spirit of Yahveh's legalism. The true king's heart, as the late gnomic writer said, "is in the hand of Yahveh as the watercourses.

[86] For example see I Kings 3 14, where such a gloss is put into the story of the vision of Solomon. See also *ibid.* 2 3; 6 11–13.

[87] The influence of the king, as the personal covenant between God and the Israelites who brought down divine law and justice, upon the Messianic expectation can be seen by a glance at Is. 9 6, and 42 1–4.

He turneth it whithersoever he will" (Prov. 21 1). He was inspired by Yahveh's wisdom, his life was drawn from the Stream, he was exalted as long as he kept in this relationship of mediator of the Stream to men, and debased when he failed to do so. And like the Hellenistic monarchs the prince of Israel was idealized as the source of salvation for his people. "In the light of the king's countenance is life; and his favor is as a cloud of the latter rain" (Prov. 16 15). "A king that sitteth on the throne of judgement scattereth away all evil with his eyes" (Prov. 20 8). These may be statements freshly imported from the Hellenistic monarchies, or may be ancient proverbs from the preexilic royalties, but it is impossible to say which period they represent precisely because the political philosophy behind both was identical.

Was this whole form of literature in which the king was praised in these exalted terms a meaningless flattery which had no significance in practical rulership? Many scholars see in such descriptions of kingship only the cringing of courtiers, whose phrases might be endured or demanded by the king, but which remained only phrases taken seriously by neither king nor subject, and which accordingly have no value for our opinion of the political philosophy that really lay behind the government of the period. In this connection it must again be pointed out that this conception of kingship appears in Israel not merely in the adulations of the king psalms, but woven into the warp and woof of the historical narratives as well. If the books of Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles have anything to teach it is that this sort of kingship was universally axiomatic to the people. Similarly in later history, in the time of Israel's decline and collapse as a nation, while the people despaired at not having found ideal kings to save them from their enemies, they yet preserved the old terms of king adulation and trust, and transposed them into a passionate expectation that still in the future such a king would come. It is no set of "Hofstil" phrases which have thus been transformed into the enduring hope of Israel. Such objects of racial devotion as the Messianic hope of Israel come not in practice from foaming phrases, but from the heart's deepest convictions of a people.

And this great hope came from the king=faith of a nation that had long looked in vain to its rulers for the salvation of Yahveh, but had looked with such implicit belief that when kings and the nation were no more, still the faith found a way to survive. If in these present days of general enlightenment and of disillusionment about royalties, the dream of the "legitimist" is still a force in European politics, it is hardly to be viewed as surprising that in ancient Babylon, Egypt, and Israel, yes in Hellenistic Greece and Imperial Rome, these exalted conceptions of royalty should have been tolerated or encouraged because the popular acceptance of such a conception of monarchy was the best force at the monarch's command for keeping his rule inviolate. And the conception would have been believed by the people for the only reason men have ever believed in anything, because the belief made life more hopeful and happy for the believer. If humanity held only to those beliefs which are reasonable and probable most religions of the world would collapse. The belief that the king is God's representative on earth with more than human powers, and that he is particularly God's agent of Salvation by bringing divine justice into the world and making it apply to human needs, this has from ancient times until the most recent periods of human history been a belief cherished only less passionately than that in God himself and his love. To call Louis XIV the *roi soleil* may have been "Hofstil", but it was also a splendid epitome of the practical philosophy of state at the basis of French institutions of the day, as well as being the essence of the Frenchman's loyalty to his king. To speak of the Pope's *plenitudo potestatis* may displease Protestants, yet it is the conception on which the power of the Pope in his church is founded, both in actual administration and in the hearts of the faithful. And so to call the king of old the "Shepherd of the Flock", the one at Yahveh's right hand, to whom Yahveh has given his spirit and legal wisdom, the angel of God to do justice, or, in the Greek term, the *νόμος ἔμψυχος*, was no idle flattery. It was the basis of his power over his people, and one of the few hopes in life for the subject of an oriental king.

AN EVANGELIST'S TABELLAE: SOME SECTIONS OF ORAL TRADITION IN LUKE

ALFRED M. PERRY
BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

IN conversation with a friend a good many years ago, the suggestion was made that the Great Interpolation of Luke has many of the characteristics of those collections of miscellaneous sayings which are appended to some of the prophetic books of the Old Testament. Recent attempts to compare the literary *genre* of the gospels with that of the prophets only serve to point this resemblance more clearly; and it may be observed, that as there was a tendency to collect scattered sayings and add them to a longer work already bearing the name of a prophet, so a similar tendency may be descried in the direction of gathering more or less scattered sayings ascribed to Jesus and inserting them at the latest possible point in the gospel narrative, immediately before the Passion story. Indeed, one may be thankful for the good taste and true historical sense which kept the Third Evangelist from adding such a collection as a post-Resurrection discourse, such as actually appeared in the *Apocalypse of Peter* and its later reflection, the *Testamentum Domini*, or in the *Pistis Sophia*.

To this remark, I should like to add the observation that most modern students of the Synoptic problem do scant justice to the claims of Luke's preface. With all due allowance for the conventional claims and methods of the ancient historian, the implications of Luke's identification of himself with the Christian community and the stream of Christian tradition (oral as well as

written), and his claim to have "followed out" and set forth "the certainty" of this tradition cannot easily be satisfied by a simple Two-Document hypothesis,—even less by a Three- or Four-Document theory.

For it is evident that since the Third Evangelist was himself a part of the Christian movement, his search for historical material, if it produced two or three, or more, considerable documents containing the deeds and the words of the Christ, must have yielded many another briefer reminiscence, whether written or oral, which he would fain have preserved. With equal probability one may infer that such a writer, already looking forward to his historical task, would have by him his tablets, or it may be a papyrus scroll, in which to record from time to time the notable bits of tradition which came to his ears. Indeed, it would seem to be the greatest weakness of the Chicago theory, at least so far as it is set forth in Dr. Burton's published writings, that it does not allow sufficient space for some such contact with the oral tradition as the historical probabilities in the case all incline us to expect.

Joining together these two observations, we are led to the hypothesis that in at least a part of Luke's Great Interpolation we are in a position to define with a certain degree of precision the evangelist's relation to the oral tradition. I wish, therefore, to examine portions of this material on the hypothesis that here the evangelist is incorporating such a notebook (most probably his own) containing miscellaneous traditions of Jesus gathered under various circumstances. I shall treat here the end of the Great Interpolation and the brief interpolation which follows it, that is, Luke 14 1 — 18 14, and 19 1—27.

I. LUKAN INDEPENDENCE OF MATTHEW IN LUKE 14—19.

One of the striking features of the section Luke 14—19 is the general independence of its materials, save for the Markan interpolation, Luke 18 15—43. This independence is apparent upon even a casual reference to any harmony of the gospels; but a study of the materials will reveal its true extent and significance.

Aside from the Markan interpolation, the section contains 175 verses. Reserving the "Q-Apocalypse" for the time, we find in the remainder at least 106 verses which have no gospel parallel. The greater part of this material will be seen to be parabolic, the sixteen sections including nine parables; while in the rest of the block there are only three parables, and all of these differ so widely from their Matthew parallels that their derivation from a common literary source is frequently denied. To these we turn first.

A. Three Parables common to Luke and Matthew.

1. The Parable of the Great Supper, Luke 14 15–24, has probably no immediate literary relation to the Matthew parable (Matt. 22 1–10). So Harnack, Weiss, and Streeter agree that "the variations are too great to make a common Greek source probable."[1] The greatest agreement in language is in the opening verses (vv. 15–17), where it is only 33 per cent, and the average for the whole parable is only 18 per cent. It is, indeed, difficult to see how the same parable could well have been told in language more widely different; only the key words are common to the two gospels. We may well assume, therefore, that we have to do here, not with common dependence upon a single literary source, but with what Streeter calls "overlapping sources;" that is, with different traditions of the same parable, whose history we are not now able to trace.

2. The Parable of the Lost Sheep, Luke 15 4–7, is usually assigned to Q; but Streeter's discussion of it is illuminating.[2] Even here the verbal resemblance is not close enough to require a common literary source,—verse 6 is peculiar to Luke, and the agreement in the rest is only 32 per cent, and confined, as Streeter remarks, to "the words without which the story could not be told at all."

[1] Easton, B. S., *Gospel according to St. Luke*, p. 230; cf. Weiss, B., "Die Quellen der Synoptischen Überlieferung", in *Texte u. Unters.*, 32, 3, S. 59, 135; Harnack, A., *The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 122; Streeter, B. H., *The Four Gospels*, p. 243—5.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 245.

3. The Parable of the Pounds, Luke 19 11—27. The complexity of the literary relationships here has been frequently pointed out, and conflation of Q with some other source is a solution commonly advanced.[3] To the parable of the King Suppressing Rebellion (vv. 12, 14, 27), there is no parallel, unless there be remote resemblance in Matt. 22 7. In the rest however, there is a considerable degree of verbal agreement, averaging about 31 per cent, but rising to 45 per cent in vv. 20—23, and to 57 per cent in vv. 24—26. The greatest similarity is in v. 26, but this is clearly an epigram capable of independent transmission, just as Bultmann classifies it.[4] This verbal agreement leads Harnack to say, "Here it is quite evident that there is at the background a single traditional source declaring itself even in details of phraseology;" and to add the note, "The synonyms are not translation-variants, but are linguistic corrections made by Luke."[5]

Yet the case is not quite so simple. As in the previous instance, the parallels are largely limited to the essential details without which the story could not be told, and there is a subtle variety in the arrangement of these common details, even, so pervasive as to suggest rather the fluidity of some stage of oral transmission than merely editorial improvements. Add now to this the wide disagreement in the essential details of the story, which Harnack himself notes:—

1) Luke has minae, Matthew talents.
2) Luke has ten servants, though he afterwards mentions but three; Matthew mentions but three, though he seems to imply all.
3) In Luke all receive the same capital, in Matthew each after his ability.
4) In Luke they are bidden to trade, in Matthew receive no orders.

[3] With "L", Weiss, *op. cit.*, S. 145—6; with "M", Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 282; and compare Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 123—6.

[4] Bultmann, R., *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, S. 62.

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 124.

5) In Luke the gains vary according to ability, in Matthew the gain is uniform.
6) In Luke the reward is proportioned to the profit, in Matthew it is the same for all the faithful.

It is evident from this that the two parables are differently conceived throughout. Since, in addition, the verbal agreement nowhere passes much beyond the minimum of what must be expected in the use of a common literary source, and is even then belied by the different articulation of the phrases, we may decide with some degree of probability that the relation of the Luke and Matthew parables, even here, is not documentary but is rather that of good oral tradition, possibly resting on a single Greek source.[6]

These three parables contain 33 verses, which, added to the peculiar materials, give us a total of 139 verses which do not appear to have any immediate documentary relation to Matthew. Bearing in mind what we are able to learn elsewhere of Luke's literary habit of using his sources mainly in blocks, this large proportion of the total seems sufficient to create a presumption that the entire section, Luke 14 1—19 27 is similarly independent, save for the Markan interpolation Luke 18 15—43.

It is now necessary to examine from this point of view the small proportion of materials remaining.

B. Sayings in triple tradition.

Aside from the "Q-apocalypse," there remain 21 verses of materials more or less closely paralleled in Matthew. These we must study verse by verse. Certain of them, also, have parallels in Mark as well, and may be taken up first.

Luke 14 1—6 is an example of healing on the Sabbath, to some extent duplicating that in Mark 3 1—6, into which context indeed Matthew has inserted his parallel to v. 5. Outside of this verse the only parallels to Matthew are those in which the situation is

[6] Should this conclusion be questioned, however, it should be noted that this section stands at the very end of the block and may not be closely related to the rest.

stated, which are Markan, and the two words ἰδοῦ and θεραπεῦσαι, — the second of these is also Markan and occurs in the immediate context (Mk. v. 2), while the former has no particular significance for literary relationships. In general Luke has greater similarity to Mark than to Matthew, yet Luke is quite clearly independent of Mark, for the miracle is different in all its details and the verbal agreement, even in vv. 2—4, is only 33 per cent. There is certainly no reason to think of any agreement of Luke with Matthew alone, save in v. 5, which is an independent logion, to be discussed later.

Luke 14 25—27, Carrying the Cross. V. 27 has resemblances to Mark 8 34 (33 per cent) and to Matthew (60 per cent), but the Matthew parallel shares with Mark the additional word ἀκολουθεῖ. Hence, since Matthew and Luke use this verse in the same context, it would seem probable that Luke is dependent upon a non-Markan source, which Matthew has also employed, with slight assimilation to the Markan language.

Luke 14 34—35, the Salt. Luke v. 34 is in close agreement with Mark 9 50 (77 per cent), while Matthew (5 13) is more remote (54 per cent). The only agreement against Mark, μωρανθῇ, is an obvious improvement of Mark's language, and so not significant. Luke here appears dependent on Mark; but Matthew is probably independent of both, since the appended statement differs as widely as possible from Lk. v. 35. Mark's addition (v. 50c) is clearly secondary as compared with Luke's (v. 35a).

The Law of Divorce, Luke 16 18, offers a notoriously complicated problem. As the texts stand the Markan version (Mark 10 11—12) is most nearly unique in language and in statement; yet it seems to furnish the common basis for the other statements. The Roman law in Mark, v. 12, which permits the woman to divorce her husband, is naturally changed in Matthew and Luke to fit Oriental customs. So also Mark's difficult and ambiguous μοιχᾶται ἐπ' αὐτήν (v. 11) is altered, either by dropping the prepositional phrase (Lk. v. 18, Mt. 19 9) or by closer definition (Mt. 5 32). The verbal agreements of Luke and Matt. 5 against Mark are merely stylistic and could well be accidental, while Luke agrees with Mark in language and in thought nearly as closely

as with Matthew (with Mk. 59 pc.; with Mt. 5 32, 65 pc.). It would appear, then, that the four statements go back ultimately to a primitive form not unlike that of Mark, and that no other written source need be, nor indeed can be, posited. This leaves still open to some extent the question whether Mark itself is the actual source.

Luke 17 2, the Millstone around the Neck, shows close resemblance to Mark 9 42 (77 per cent) and has no agreements with Matthew against Mark. The connection with v. 1 (= Mt. 18 6) is natural and could have been made independently by Matthew and Luke. (It is even possible that the whole of v. 2 is an early harmonistic corruption of the Lukan text). No written source other than Mark need be sought here.

Luke 17 6 is clearly independent of Mark 11 23; for the only common elements are the words "faith" and "the sea." Here again Matthew has a doublet. In 21 21 he follows Mark, but in 17 20 he seems to be largely independent. In the latter the Lukan contacts are only the phrase ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως and the conditional form of the sentence (and the conditions are of different order). The verbal agreement of Luke with Matthew is but 23 per cent. A documentary relationship therefore seems doubtful.

To sum up: of verses having a parallel in Mark, three, Luke 14 34; 16 18; 17 2, seem to have been drawn from Mark; at 14 27 Luke seems to have used a source also used by Matthew; and in 14 2—4 and 17 6 Luke is probably quite independent of documentary relationship to any other gospel.

C. Sayings common to Matthew and Luke.

With this light upon the Markan influence in this section, we may pass on to the remaining verses which have Matthew parallels.

Luke 14 5 is a logion quite capable of transmission independently. It shows but slight agreement with Matthew (33 per cent) and is quite evidently a bit of floating tradition, as easily derived from oral as from written sources. Since vv. 1—4 are quite independent of Matthew, there is no reason for attributing any part of Luke 14 1—6 to a written source.

Luke 14 11 is quite evidently what Bultmann calls it, "a floating saying that was attached to the tradition now here, now there."[7] It appears again at 18 14, and the Matthew parallel (23 12) is in quite a different connection. Such an epigram as this, though there is considerable resemblance (58 per cent), certainly does not require a documentary relationship to account for it. The same is true of the brief saying, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear," in v. 35b.

Luke 14 25—27 presents a difficult problem. It is quite possible, as Streeter suggests,[8] that v. 27 "belongs to that class of proverb-like sayings which would be likely to be circulated in different forms by word of mouth": but the Luke-Matthew resemblance is close (60 per cent,—twice as great as the Markan contacts) and the joining of the two ideas of Breaking Home Ties (v. 26) and of Bearing the Cross (v. 27) is not so obvious that the two evangelists would have been likely to arrive at it independently. Yet examination of v. 26 shows few verbal agreements (21 per cent) and the differences are just such as oral transmission would create. Even here, therefore, the case for a common written source is not clear, though it seems stronger than that for the alternate hypothesis, that the two verses were transmitted together for some time in the Greek oral tradition, the first being much modified, the second less so. V. 25 is, of course, editorial.

In the Saying about Salt, Luke 14 34—35, the Luke-Matthew contacts in the second colon are slight (18 per cent), and it has already been shown that in the first (v. 34) Luke's dependence is rather upon Mark than upon Matthew. But v. 35 is not capable of independent transmission, without v. 34; so it becomes clear that no common documentary source for Luke and Matthew can be demonstrated. The phrase "he that hath ears," etc., in v. 35, is a common tag without significance for the sources.[9]

The middle of chapter 16 contains a conglomeration of short unrelated sayings, four of which (Lk. 16 13, 16—17, 18) are parallel-

[7] *Op. cit.*, S. 62.
[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 191.
[9] Hawkins, J. C., *Horae Synopticae*[2], p. 106.

ed in Matthew. The Matthew parallels, however, are scattered (6 24; 11 12 f.; 5 18; 5 32), so that the grouping can hardly be deemed significant, and the sayings must be treated individually.

Luke 16 13, Serving Two Masters, is in complete agreement with Matt. 6 24 save that Matthew omits οἰκέτης; so documentary relationship must be assumed. The saying is an independent logion (so Bultmann)[10] and its context in Luke is artificial (*ad. voc.*, μαμωνᾷ). Vv. 14—15, which follow, are without any connection.

Luke 16 16 is much briefer than its parallel, Matt. 11 12—13; but its verbal agreement is not above the average (52 per cent) and the order of the clauses is reversed. The thought also differs widely. Luke is a fairly clear statement of the common idea, suggested as early as Paul and fully developed in Hebrews, that the older dispensation is past and everyone who now seeks salvation "is compelled" to enter through the Gospel. If Matthew had this before him, it is difficult to see how he could have reduced it to such confusion as his language reveals; but on the other hand, Luke would hardly have thrown over the witness of the older dispensation to the new, as it is set forth in Matt. v. 13. The relationship must rest, therefore, upon oral tradition rather than upon written sources.

Luke 16 17 shows large verbal agreement with Matthew (73 per cent); though the sentences are recast in order as much as might well be, and the purport is somewhat altered (especially if we feel that Luke has an ironic ring which Matthew has entirely missed). These changes are, however, within the limits of editorial treatment; and so it is more probable that the two versions do go back to a common written source.

Luke 16 18. It has already been suggested that the resemblances here are best explained by reference to the Markan version. The contacts of Luke and Matt. 5 32, — πᾶς ὁ with the participle and the perfect passive participle in the second colon,—are not significant against the differences which also appear.

[10] *Op. cit.*, S. 43.

The remaining verses, Luke 17 1–6, also fall into a group, immediately following the parable. It is noteworthy that in this instance the Matthew parallels also are to some extent grouped (Mt. 18 7, 6, 15, 21; 17 20).

In Luke 17 1 the Matthew contacts are limited (29 per cent,—41 per cent if the introduction be excluded) and the word-order varies.

Luke 17 2 (see above) seems dependent on Mark, though the order of the clauses is changed to make connection with v. 1.

Luke 17 3–4 is expanded in Matthew to seven verses, obviously later application, but quite beyond the limits of merely editorial treatment; yet the expansions cannot stand alone. Luke is obviously more primitive. The verbal agreement is fairly low (43 per cent in v. 3; 47 per cent in v. 4) and is not significant; but the language varies wherever it can do so.

Luke 17 5 is apparently editorial; on v. 6 see above. It seems independent of both Matthew and Mark.

Further, the common order of Matthew and Luke has little significance, for it comes down to only three verses, scattered in Matthew (Mt. 18 7, 15, 21), and the real sequence of thought is quite different. Luke connects "offenses"—"forgiveness of offense"; Matthew, punishment of the "offender," and punishment of the obdurate. Whatever the traditional roots of the passage, therefore, no written source will be sought, save that v. 2 is derived from Mark.

Luke 18 14b (see above on Lk. 14 11).

It appears, therefore, that the larger part of the resemblance between Luke and Matthew in this section of Luke's gospel can fairly be attributed to the accidents of tradition, to independent transmission of sayings, or to the overlapping of sources. There remain, however, at least six verses where there is strong evidence of documentary relationship. Luke 14 34; 16 18; 17 2 seem to bear such a relation to Mark, with a further reminiscence (editorial?) at 14 25; while Luke 14 27 (perhaps with v. 26); 16 13, 17 seem to require a written source used also by Matthew.

These verses are a very small proportion of the whole section; but they constitute a fact that requires explanation, which may be sought in different directions. On the one hand, the verses are hardly too many to be explained away entirely, on the theory of an early harmonistic corruption of the text; yet such a method would be too cavalier. Rather, it is better to accept them as veritable instances of the use of common written sources. But it should at once be noted that this use is very different from that made in other portions of the gospel. Here there is no such care for the integrity of the source nor such practical exhaustion of its contents. Rather, these scattered excerpts suggest the notes of a hasty reader, jotting down a few precious phrases which he must not forget. This fact seems significant, not only for the materials themselves, but for their contexts; but before we attempt to estimate it we must review the section yet unconsidered, the apocalypse of Luke 17 20—37.

D. The "Apocalypse of Q."

The apocalyptic passage, Luke 17 20—37 presents clearer evidence of documentary relationships than almost any other passage in the section of the gospel we are considering. Vv. 23—24, 26—27, 30, 34—35 are paralleled in the same order (though in two blocks) in Matthew 24 26—27, 37—41; and v. 37 appears in the same context at Matt. 24 28, in what may well have been its original connection. The average agreement in these verses is exactly 50 per cent, which seems enough, taken with the common order, to make the use of a common written source the best explanation of the resemblances. Such a source would already include half of the section; but other verses must be assigned to it, also.

Vv. 28—29, which parallel vv. 26—27 after the fashion of so much of the "Q" material, were rather omitted by Matthew in interpolating into Mark than added by Luke. The prophecy of persecution in v. 22 is a formal part of the apocalyptic scheme (cf. Mk. 13 9—13), but is of necessity omitted by Matthew. "Lo, the Kingdom among you" (v. 21), if taken in an eschatological sense, with ἐστίν timeless, may also have belonged to this source, and

it may be reflected in the improvement of Mark at Matt. 24 23. It is equally possible, however, that it is a doublet of v. 24, as Bultmann suggests.[11] V. 20 is editorial introduction. Adding these verses we should have a brief apocalypse containing Luke 17 22 (20)—24, 26—30, 34—37. The remaining verses must be examined in this light.

The prediction of the death of the Son of Man (v. 25) is a bold interruption of the context and may well be an editorial interpolation in place of the transposed v. 37.[12] A reminiscence of Mark 8 31 is sufficient to account for it. Luke 17 33 shows yet closer agreement (73 %) with the same passage of Mark (Mk. 8 35), and it too interrupts the context. It is difficult, it is true, to predicate what variation would be possible in this common saying, independently transmitted (at 9 24 Luke quotes the same saying verbatim), and this version is the most literary form of the logion. It is not less difficult, however, to suppose this a part of the eschatological source, and it is best explained as also a reminiscence of Mark.

Luke 17 31 has also a Mark parallel (Mk. 13 15—16). Here the verbal agreement is moderate (53 per cent), and the order of words, unlike Matthew's, differs widely from Mark's. It is a striking fact, too, that Luke's language is inferior to Mark's: the phrase *καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ*, though perhaps more vivid, is quite awkward, and it is hard to believe it due to editorial improvement of Mark. The verse is likewise quite in point here, and the impression is that we have here an overlapping of tradition, rather than a mere reflection of Mark. Matthew would naturally omit so close a parallel to a verse just copied. If v. 31 is not Markan, then v. 32 will naturally be assigned to the same source, and serves to link it to vv. 28—29.

It appears, then, that in Luke 17 22 (20)—37 we have the substance of a brief apocalypse, known and used by both Luke and Matthew, which has suffered interpolation from Mark at vv. 25, 33

[11] *Ibid.*, S. 73.

[12] Cf. Easton, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

(and possibly v. 31) and some transposition at v. 37. Such an apocalyptic flyleaf, as has often been argued for Mark 13,[13] could easily have been transmitted independently in written form, and thus be used as a source by the two evangelists.

E. The Limits of Luke's Independence.

To sum up: The materials of the section Luke 14 1—18 14; 19 1—27 are quite diverse in their literary relationships. They consist of the following:—

1) Nine parables peculiar to Luke (Lk. 14 28—33; 15 8—32; 16 1—12, 19—31; 17 7—10; 18 1—14) 74 verses
2) Two striking narratives peculiar to Luke (Lk. 17 11—19; 19 1—10) 19 verses
3) Four other sections peculiar to Luke (Lk. 14 6—10, 12—14; 15 1—3; 16 14—15) 13 verses
4) Three parables also in Matthew, independently (Lk. 14 15—24; 15 4—7; 19 11—27) 31 verses
5) Sayings also in Matthew, but independently (Lk. 14 1—5, 11, 25, 35; 16 16; 17 1, 3—6, 20—21) 16 verses
6) Brief sayings drawn from Mark 8 31—10 12 (Lk. 14 34; 16 18; 17 2, 25, 33; perh. 14 27) 5 verses
7) Brief sayings with relation to Matthew (Lk. 14 26—27; 16 13, 17; perh. vv. 16, 18) 4 verses
8) Brief apocalypse also in Matthew (Lk. 17 22 (20)—37, ex. vv. 25, 33) 13 verses

This makes up the total of 175 verses. The total of independent materials ("1"—"5" above) is 153 verses. Although these figures may be disputed in some details, they cannot be very greatly altered, and the proportion is significant.

The Mark parallels noted amount to five (or possibly six) verses, two (or three) of which are doublets of the much quoted sayings also introduced at Luke 9 22—24. All of the parallel passages, indeed, are found in a single panel of Mark, as follows:—

[13] By Colani, 1864, and since adopted by most.

Luke 14 25, 27	=	Mark 8 34
14 34	=	9 50
16 18	=	10 11—12
17 2	=	9 42
17 25	=	8 31
17 33	=	8 35

There is no agreement in order; but the coincidence in the general location of these passages is worthy of note.[14] It would suggest that Luke drew these verses either from a casual reading of *a portion* of the gospel of Mark, or from a source which Mark is here incorporating more fully. Luke's independent addition of 14 35 (and of 14 26?) may be evidence for the latter; but the materials are too scanty to prove anything.[15] It should be particularly observed, however, that such use of Mark as is here predicated is very different in scope and manner from that which characterizes the Markan sections of Luke, and belongs, apparently, to *a different stage in the composition of the gospel.*

It may be remarked that Hawkins[16] denies Markan influence in all of these passages, dismissing two as doublets in Luke and the others as veiled doublets, though he does admit that the case for Markan derivation is quite strong in Luke 14 34 and 17 2. The point just observed, however, is sufficient to reconcile "Luke's disuse of Mark" in the Great Interpolation with such occasional, perhaps indirect, influence as is here predicated.

The Matthew parallels are scarcely more numerous. They include the "Q-apocalypse" (Lk. 17 22—37 = Mt. 24 26—28, 37—41) with four other verses, Luke 14 26—27 (= Mt. 10 37—38); 16 13 (= Mt. 6 24); 16 17 (= Mt. 5 18); and possibly Luke 16 16, 18 (= Mt. 11 12; 5 32). One of these parallels is in Matthew's missionary discourse, and two (or three) in his Sermon on the Mount.

[14] A further possible parallel to this section of Mark, Lk. 13 30 = Mk. 10 31, seems attributable rather to overlapping tradition.

[15] But note that it is with the *next verse* of Mark (10 13) that Luke (at 18 15) resumes his use of Mark as a major source.

[16] Hawkins, J. C., in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 35—41.

As has been remarked, their significance might be entirely explained away as due to harmonistic corruption, or to unusually good oral tradition; yet it is more probable that Luke has made a casual use of some written document, some brief compilation of sayings like the Oxyrhinchus "logia," which was also used by Matthew. There is no evidence to show whether this was attached to the apocalyptic "flyleaf" of 17 22—37, or indeed, to some other of the common sources, though the latter is perhaps unlikely. Whether Luke incorporated from these "logia" any further materials, which were not taken up by Matthew, we cannot say from the evidence at our disposal; only Luke 14 33 suggests itself, and the supposition is unlikely, when Luke's known use of these materials is so small. This same consideration would apply in the case of the Markan materials as well.

II. THE USE OF ORAL TRADITION IN LUKE 14—19.

It is now apparent how largely Luke is independent of the other gospels in this panel of his work, and likewise of any written sources used by them. It yet remains to ask whether we can come any closer than this to a discovery of the origins of the materials and of his method of collecting them. There are, of course, no tests which will clearly distinguish materials taken from oral tradition from similar matter found in a written document; but a further review of the materials will be of some help at this point. We may begin with the most striking body of these, the Lukan "Sondergut," asking what indications we can find, either as to the nature of their source, or their relation to other known Lukan sources.

A. Review of the materials entirely peculiar to Luke.

These materials were passed over at the beginning of this study; but they constitute more than half of the block. They represent continuous, closely-wrought materials, and therefore form but a few pericopes,—only 15 in 106 verses. These consist of nine

parables, five of which are narratives,[17] two other sections of discourse (Lk. 14 7–10, described as a "parable," and 14 12–14), two sections of narrative (Lk. 17 11–19; 19 1–10), and two brief sections (Lk. 15 1–3; 16 14–15) of which the first is wholly, the second partly, editorial.

In all of these sections one feels, what is the most noticeable feature of the materials, a marked literary quality. This can be traced not only in the fulness and unity of the narration, but in other qualities as well. (a) The narrative interest is strong. Though these are largely discourse materials, there are two vivid narratives and at least five narrative parables. Yet in these sections, even the discourses, there is a large use of quotation and conversation (only Lk. 14 12–14; 15 1–3; 16 14–15 lack it), and this use is so animated that in one or two instances (Lk. 15 21, cf. 19 25) the words of one speaker are interrupted by another. Again, the thoughts of the characters are frequently represented in soliloquy (Lk. 15 17; 16 3; 18 4–5, 11–13). (b) Vivid and picturesque details not needed for the story are present in most of the sections,—e. g., the pods fed to the prodigal's swine (Lk. 15 16), or the dogs that licked Lazarus' sores (Lk. 16 21), etc.; and in these sections we find some of the clearest character-drawing that the gospels afford,—the father meeting the returning Prodigal, the elder brother later in the same parable, the unjust steward, the unrighteous judge, the Pharisee in the Temple, and perhaps others, though both Dives and Lazarus are types and not individualized.

In all of this there is a color and glow that one recognizes as the height of literary art. The Parable of the Prodigal Son is justly recognized as the finest short story in the world's literature; but the same literary quality pervades much of the material now before us,—the story of Zacchaeus, the parable of the Pharisee and Publican, and, though the subject is less pleasing, those of the Unrighteous Steward, and Unrighteous Judge. No other section of the gospel, I think, so frequently reaches the peak of

[17] The narrative parables are Luke 15 11–32; 16 1–12, 19–31; 18 1–8, 9–14; the others are Luke 14 28–30, 31f; 15 8–10; 17 7–10.

literary art as do these materials; yet the same quality can be detected elsewhere in the Lukan writings,—e. g., in the Shepherds in the Fields (Lk. 2 8–20), in the Call of Simon (Lk. 5 1–11), in the Walk to Emmaus (Lk. 24 13–35), in the Shipwreck of Paul (Ac. 27), and, many would add, in the Sermon at Nazareth (Lk. 4 16–30). Just this quality is hard to find, however, outside of the Lukan writings, save perhaps in the appendix to the Fourth Gospel (Jn. 21 3–13) and the pericope *de adultera* (Jn. 8 2–11). Such distribution suggests the hand of the evangelist himself, and this hypothesis is usually accepted. The point I wish to make here is that it characterizes these chapters to an unusual extent, suggesting that here the evangelist was working with more than customary liberty.[18] The use of oral instead of written sources would be sufficient to give this larger freedom.

A further characteristic of these materials may be found in an inclination toward the viewpoint of the "wisdom literature" of the Old Testament, which also accords with what we know of the high-minded common-sense of the evangelist. An ethic based on practical expediency appears in many of the sections (cf. Lk. 14 7–10, 28–32; 15 11–13; 16 1–8; 18 5) and there is an especial interest in the right use of money (cf. Lk. 15 11–13; 16 9; 16 19–25; 19 8–9;—also 19 23). A number of allusions to the book of Proverbs are also found (Lk. 14 10, 29–30; 15 13, 16; 16 15b) and Nestle's margin notes only one other in Luke (cf. Lk. 2 52). This "wisdom" character becomes most apparent when one compares these materials with the expressions of a similar viewpoint, or even language, in such a passage as Sirach 29—35.[19] It is, in fact, just this air of practical expediency that has proven most

[18] On the other hand, the occurrences of the words and phrases of Hawkins' list of Lukan characteristics are below the average in all of these sections, except Lk. 14 12–14, and the two narratives 17 11–19; 19 1–10.

[19] For similarity of viewpoint and theme, and sometimes allusion, on Lk. 14 7–10, cf. Sir. 31 18; 32 1; Lk. 14 12–14, cf. Sir. 29 1f, 9–13, 31 23; Lk. 14 28–32, cf. Sir. 32 18–19; Lk. 15 11–13, cf. Sir. 30 1–13, 33 19–23; Lk. 16 4, 9, cf. Sir. 31 23; Lk. 16 19–26, cf. Sir. 31 5, 8; Lk. 16 27–31, cf. Sir. 34 2–3; Lk. 17 7–10, cf. Sir. 33 24–28; Lk. 18 1–6, cf. Sir. 35 12, 14; Lk. 18 7–8, cf. Sir. 35 18; Lk. 18 9–14, cf. Sir. 34 24, 26, 35 3,9; Lk. 19 1–10, cf. Sir. 34 26—35 7.

difficult for the pious interpreters of such sections as the parables of the Unrighteous Steward and the Unrighteous Judge.

Beyond these qualities, however, common characteristics are few. Though the thought is not narrowly Jewish, most of the sections bear some marks of Jewish origin. The eschatology is cast largely in Jewish terminology, with reference to the Messianic banquet (Lk. 14 15, cf. 12 37) where one may recline in "Abraham's bosom" (Lk. 16 23), to the resurrection of the *just* (Lk. 14 14), and to eternal tents (Lk. 16 9). The Pharisaic doctrine of reward and merit seems to be accepted in several passages (Lk. 14 12—14; 16 9, 25,—cf. Matt. 6 2, 5, 16), but contested in Luke 17 10; and "justification" seems to be used also in a Pharisaic sense (Lk. 16 15; 18 9, 14). The Parousia is twice reflected (Lk. 18 7—8; 16 31) unless the latter passage is solely a reference to the Resurrection of Jesus. Angels are mentioned, once as denizens of Heaven (Lk. 15 10), once as ministers of the Divine Will (Lk. 16 22). There are several touches of Jewish legalism (Lk. 16 29; 17 12, 14; 18 12; 19 8), and Jewish prejudice against swine and dogs also appears (Lk. 15 15; 16 21). Jewish idiom may be discovered, also, in the use of a periphrasis for the name of God (Lk. 15 7, 10), and the phrase "son of Abraham" (Lk. 19 9, cf. 16 22, 25).

On the other hand, there is a polemic against Judaism and Pharisaism on behalf of the Christian community. An editorial summary repeated from Mark (Lk. 15 1—3, cf. 5 29—30 = Mk. 2 15—16),[20] the Prodigal's elder brother (Lk. 15 25—32), the request of Dives in Gehenna (Lk. 16 27—31), all reflect Jewish hostility to a Gentile Christianity, while other passages defend Christian acceptance of the outcast (Lk. 15 7, 10; 17 18; 19 9—10) and at least one section (Lk. 18 8) seems to reflect actual persecution of the Church. There is likewise an element of attack on Pharisaic hypocrisy and show (Lk. 16 14—15) not unlike that of Matthew 6 1—18.

The so-called "socialism" which appears at some other points in Luke is also found here. The idea of a future reversal of social status recurs (Lk. 14 14; 16 9), and the judgement of the rich man and of Lazarus is apparently strictly on an economic basis (Lk.

[20] This section must then belong to the composition of the present work.

16 25), while the anti-Pharisaic polemic of Luke 16 14 has a similar note of economic conflict. Luke 16 9—12 seems designed to give comfort to the poor in their present station, and an interest in almsgiving appears in Luke 14 13—14 (cf. 6 30—35); 16 8—9, and 19 8. Interest in other despised groups is also found,—in publicans (Lk. 18 13; 19 2), in Samaritans (Lk. 17 16), in women (Lk. 15 8—10; 18 3—5) and actual persecution appears in one verse (Lk. 18 7).

In general these materials reflect a peasant or lower class viewpoint: the woman's one drachma is a great loss (Lk. 15 8—10), the householder has a single slave (Lk. 17 7—9), the writer knows how the beggar is "laid" at the rich man's door (Lk. 16 20—21), and the rich man's steward is felt to occupy high position (Lk. 16 1—3). On the other hand, the narrator's fancy, like popular fancy everywhere, even in America, likes to play about the figure of a king (Lk. 14 31—32, cf. 19 12) or of a wealthy landowner (Lk. 15 11; 16 1; 16 19).

The social setting, however, is by no means uniform. Many of the sections seem to betray the rural viewpoint which appears so frequently in the gospels (Lk. 14 28; 15 20, 23, 25; 17 7, and cf. 14 18—19, 23; 15 4—7);[21] but other passages seem to reflect quite as clearly the life, not merely of the village, but of the city (Lk. 15 8—10; 16 19—21; 18 2—6; 19 1, cf. 14 21; 19 23), while Jerusalem and its Temple form the setting for one parable (Lk. 18 10),—though it is possible that the actual description would fit a village synagogue better.

Some of the pericopes seem to show an apologetic interest in the expanding mission of Christianity, and in its passage to the Gentile world (Lk. 15 8—10, 11—32; 18 10—14, cf. 15 4—7; 14 15—24). Other religious interests are few, beyond the practical ethic already alluded to, and the eschatological references. But repentance is somewhat emphasized (Lk. 15 8—10, 11—32; 18 13; 19 8, cf. 15 4—7), faith is once indicated (Lk. 17 19) in a section somewhat unique, and there are two parables on prayer (Lk. 18 2—6, 9—14).

[21] This is a rather striking note of authenticity, in the tradition of a movement so largely urban as primitive Christianity. Contrast Paul's figures.

To sum up, these materials are characterized by a considerable degree of uniformity in the literary style, both in the parables and in the discourse and narrative matter, and this style seems to be that of the evangelist himself. On the other hand, there is also apparent a considerable diversity of viewpoint and of social setting, and few distinctive traits can be found to give the materials a fundamental unity. The obvious conclusion from such phenomena would be that here the evangelist was dealing with scattered or fragmentary materials, collected as they attracted him, and was reworking them with more freedom than he usually accorded himself. The latter fact suggests the use rather of oral than of written materials. Thus the internal data seem to confirm our initial hypothesis that this panel of Luke consists of a notebook largely composed of disconnected bits of the oral tradition.

B. Review of the remaining materials.

The three parables which have parallels in Matthew have some features in common with the unique materials, as has been indicated by occasional references above. Some details may be added. (a) The parable of the Lost Sheep (Lk. 15 4—7) has much the same literary quality as that of the Lost Coin with which it is paired, notably in just those touches which are lacking in the Matthean version,—the shepherd putting the lamb on his shoulders, and the direct discourse in v. 6. (b) The parable of the Great Supper (Lk. 14 15—24) likewise has much of the Lukan vividness (contrast the Matthean version, Mt. 22 1—10), with direct discourse and with the unforgettable characterization of the unwilling guests. The Messianic banquet (v. 15) and the generally rural setting (vv. 18—19, 23; but cf. v. 21) are further notes in common with some of the peculiar materials. (c) The parable of the Pounds, however (Lk. 19 11—27) is scarcely as vivid as its Matthew parallel (Mt. 25 14—30). It employs direct discourse, and even interruption in conversation (v. 25), but it has few of the unessential details which give color to the Lukan parables, unless the inserted parable (vv. 12, 14, 27) be so regarded. There do appear, however, the peasant interest in kings (v. 12) and the interest in the use of mon-

ey (v. 23), as well as the Christian hope of judgement on the Jews (v. 27). Even this parable, then, may, with the other two, be associated with the Lukan group, quite reasonably.

The remaining scattered materials with remote parallels in Matthew, apparently adventitious, have few distinguishing characteristics. The only narrative is that of a Sabbath healing (Lk. 14 1—6), in which only one verse (v. 5) has a Matthew parallel, and this is a logion by itself. In this section vividness is gained by the use of suspense (cf. παρατηρούμενοι, v. 1; ἢ οὔ; v. 3). There is also a note of polemic against Pharisaic regulations. The introduction to this narrative, with several other editorial introductions (Lk. 14 1, cf. 14 25; 17 1, 5),[22] shows a high proportion of the "Lukan characteristics" of Hawkins' list; though these are not numerous in the remaining verses of the section.

The rest of these scattered materials are brief sayings (Lk. 14 11, 35; 16 16; 17 1b, 3—4, 6, 20—21). Their literary relationship to the great parables is therefore not clear. Their epigrammatic form would relate them rather to the Q materials; but even for this there is no sufficient evidence, and it would be quite as likely to characterize the unwritten tradition. Aside from the anti-legal interest in Luke 16 16 there is little to connect them in viewpoint either with the peculiar materials of this panel of the gospel, or even with one another. They deal with various topics:—reversal of status (Lk. 14 11 = 18 14b), discipleship (Lk. 14 35; 17 1, 3), the abrogation of the Law (Lk. 16 16, cf. 14 5), offenses and forgiveness (Lk. 17 1, 3—4), faith with power (Lk. 17 6), and the suddenness, or the spirituality, of the Kingdom (Lk. 17 20—21). All of them are so brief that they could have circulated independently and could have been precipitated from the oral tradition at any stage of the history of the gospel before the tradition of its text became fixed.

In the remaining materials there is no unity at all. They are likewise brief striking sayings, evidently selected for their pregnant quality, and inserted without very great relation to their context. Several are epigrammatic, even paradoxical (e. g., Lk.

[22] Direct discourse is used in one of these, Lk. 17 5.

14 27, 34; 17 33) and others are sententious (e. g. Lk. 16 17, 18; 17 2). A parable, not in narrative form, is embodied in Luke 16 13, and a brief metaphor in Luke 14 34. An interest in the conditions of discipleship appears (Lk. 14 26—27, 34; 16 13; 17 33), and in its obligations (Lk. 17 2, cf. 16 18). A condition of persecution is reflected, also (Lk. 14 27; 17 33). A legalistic viewpoint is betrayed by Luke 16 17, 18; but an anti-Jewish polemic is embodied elsewhere (Lk. 17 25, cf. also 17 2 with 19 8; 18 13) with a clear reference to the Passion as well. The "socialism" of Luke appears only in 16 13, where there is an interest in the use of money and a reflection of the poverty of the Christian community who can clearly envisage both the state of a man who has only a half-interest in a slave and the divided loyalty of the slave himself. In short, the specific interests and characteristics either of Mark (if that was the source of some of these materials), or of other Lukan sources, are not prominent in these scattered fragments, and it is therefore difficult to connect them with a *consistent* use by Luke of any *identified* document. Yet literary relationship of some sort seems probable in most of these cases; though the scattering of these verses suggests, with due recognition of Luke's usual procedure, a very casual collection of excerpts from the written sources, whatever they were.

The apocalypse of Luke 17 22—37 has a different character from anything else in the Great Interpolation; though its strong homiletical note,—"Watch!"—recalls in some degree such a passage as Luke 12 35—13 9. But the eschatological scheme of the Parousia is here developed in far greater detail, suggestive of the apocalypse of Mark 13, save that it has so large an emphasis on the suddenness of the event. There are possible hints of the Lukan "socialism" in the mention of the eating and drinking, buying and selling and building of those who are lost (vv. 27—28), and in the warning not to tarry for the possessions left behind (*τὰ σκεύη ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ*, v. 31). This section, clearly used also by Matthew, might then have been associated with the source of Luke 12 35—56; but its general subject matter and its present location make it at least equally possible that it circulated as an independent sheet.

III. THE COMPOSITION OF LUKE 14—19.

Can we now envisage historical circumstances in which these sayings, with their various relationships, could have been thus brought together? I think that we can; and that it is the hypothesis of the note-book which best explains the phenomena.

Let us put it very concretely. The Greek physician Luke, already impressed with the growing need of some more complete and permanent record of the sayings and doings of the Christ, accompanies St. Paul to Palestine, the very hearthstone of the tradition. Here is the historian's golden opportunity "to trace the course of all things accurately from the first," and he makes the most of it. The imprisonment of the apostle means for the historian a more ample opportunity. As he tarries at Caesarea some Christian friend (shall we too claim Philip?) puts into his hands a scroll which embodies a Galilean tradition of the ministry of Jesus, and he sits down at his leisure to copy it off into a fresh papyrus roll for his own use, ere he returns the original to its owner. Perhaps the process is repeated with one or two other documents, but such are hard to find at this early date. Much of the material must be acquired by word of mouth, and these occasional bits,—a brief discourse here, a group of parables there, or again a mere epigram,—he sets down as they come to him, on the blank end of the roll which has already received his larger sources. The greater part of this material will be oral; but there may be documents which he is enabled to read but cannot borrow long enough to copy them. On a visit to Jerusalem, it may be, he finds Mark already at work at a similar enterprise, looks over a couple of chapters of what he has already written (or a briefer document later used by Mark), and is permitted to jot down a few striking sayings upon the margins of his own scroll. A short apocalypse which he has copied will later fall into the hands of the First Evangelist, as also another source from which he is able to make only a few brief extracts. Thus, in a fashion increasingly haphazard, he builds up his Proto-Luke, and caps it with an account of the Passion derived perhaps from the Jerusalem church. Later, in Rome,—or later still, back in the Orient,—he at length

gets possession of Mark's completed work and incorporates that also into his earlier work, but without the full revision of the whole which he may possibly have contemplated at the first.

For the sake of putting the thing concretely, I have followed in the above account the traditional views of the authorship of the Third Gospel and of the "we-sections;" but this is not essential, since circumstances and motives not greatly dissimilar would have guided any author who could conceivably have set about the composition of the gospel. A Roman Lucius, or a Lucanus at Ephesus, gathering his materials at the mouths of pilgrims or visitors from Syria, must have proceeded in like manner. Granting the diffusion of tradition and the existence of some written sources, any other process is difficult to conceive.

We may even trace more closely the evangelist's method in this "internal appendix" of Proto-Luke. He seems to have set himself above all to collect parables, to each of which he has given unusual thought and care for literary form and style. We may perhaps imagine him returning to his lodging week by week to set down while still fresh in his mind the choicest of the words of the Lord recounted in the gathering of the church. Or perhaps we should suppose that these were materials long stored in his own memory, and shaped in his evangelistic work by his own native talent, though in such a case we might expect more of order when he finally wrote them out.[23]

Chapter 14 begins, not with a parable, but with a narrative of Sabbath healing (Lk. 14 1—6) related with a good deal of the vividness of the parable group. It has no connection with anything in these chapters, and its most obvious relation is with a similar healing of a woman (Lk. 13 10—17), with which Easton pairs it. The discourse to guests (Lk. 14 7—10) and that to hosts (vv. 12—14), are a pair in subject matter and in general style, and

[23] Be it noted that the "parable" of Lk. 14 7–10 is not the first of these. Even the Galilean Source was interrupted to make a place for the Good Samaritan (10 29–37); and the Friend at Midnight (11 5–8), the Foolish Rich Man (12 16–21), and the Barren Fig Tree (13 6–9) might well belong to the same group.

the floating epigram (v. 11) may have been attached at any stage of the history. We may assume that Luke set them down as they came to him. The parable of the Great Supper (Lk. 14 15—24) may have been already grouped with them, or may have been the next that was told him, suggested in the mind of another informant even, by what he had just noted down.

The remainder of chapter 14 centers about the theme of discipleship; but not with complete agreement. The materials consist of a pair of parables on counting the cost (vv. 28—32), of three rules on the disciple's abnegation (vv. 26, 27, 33) of which the first two are often ascribed to Q, and do in fact have some kinship with such a passage as Luke 12 22—34, and of a final pair of sayings (vv. 34 f.), the first of which is related to Mark. The literary relationships of some of the material would suggest, if we try to bear in mind what we know of Luke's use of written sources, that he had first entered on his papyrus the two parables; then, at a later date, he added on the margin, first the three brief sayings which he found in some fugitive collection of logia, and later the closing verses, hastily excerpted from a document later used by Mark. V. 25, an editorial introduction reminiscent of Mark (8 34a) was probably introduced in his final revision of the gospel; and v. 35b, is a fugitive saying easily attached at any stage of the history.

Chapter 15 consists of a group of parables on a single theme, probably recorded from the living voice as a block, with an introduction (vv. 1—3) belonging to the last stage of the gospel.

The opening parable of chapter 16 has no connection with what goes before it, and is followed by a most heterogeneous collection of brief aphorisms. One may suppose that the parable (vv. 1—7) and its conclusion (vv. 8 f), possibly also the further application (vv. 10—12) constitute the next entry from the oral tradition, followed by two independent logia, on self-righteousness (vv. 14—15, themselves composite)[24] and on the abrogation of the Law (v. 16). Later, marginal addition was made of a further saying about "mammon" (v. 13), and of another on the permanence of the Law

[24] Easton, with Weiss, connects this with ch. 15, but the connection is not close.

(v. 17), both from the logia document; and finally the Markan source furnished a saying on divorce to illustrate the improvement of the Law (v. 18). Only such a process of hasty collection can explain the incongruities of this section.

The chapter is concluded with the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the next bit of oral tradition at hand. It too stands by itself, with only the slightest connection with v. 15.

Chapter 17 opens with a loosely connected group of sayings about the social aspects of discipleship, first on offenses (v. 1), then on forgiveness (vv. 3 f). These were entered as they came to hand, and later there was added a similar saying from the Markan source (v. 2). The next entries are a saying on effective faith (vv. 5 f) probably from oral tradition, and a parable on discipleship, and the story of the Ten Lepers (vv. 7—10, 11—19), both without gospel parallels.

At this point Luke either got possession of, or chose to introduce (in his final revision?), the major portion of a brief eschatological document, also used, independently, by Matthew. This has been slightly augmented, both by the (marginal) insertion of two more Markan verses (vv. 25, 33), and also probably with the introductory saying (vv. 20f.), whose clear meaning (at least in the Greek) is opposed to the theme of the apocalypse itself. This apocalyptic section should perhaps have formed the end of the scroll.

Other materials, however, came later to the evangelist's hand, which he was not willing to pass over; and so he added from time to time four more parables: the Unrighteous Judge (Lk. 18 1—8a), with its eschatological warning already attached; the parable of Pharisee and Publican (18 9—14a), to which a floating logion has at some time been added (v. 14b, cf. Lk. 14 11; Mt. 23 12); the striking story of Zacchaeus (Lk. 19 1—9) also capped with an aphorism (v. 10) perhaps reminiscent of Mark 2 17; and finally the parable of the Pounds (Lk. 19 11—27) which, like the others, would seem also to have been drawn from the oral tradition.[25]

[25] The relationship here would seem to be that of unusually close oral tradition, possibly a single informant, rather than of a written source. Would not the parables have been the latest sayings to be committed to writing?

Thus the hypothesis of occasional notes from both oral and written tradition does account for the phenomena of Luke 14—19,—the great preponderance of peculiar material, the want of any logical arrangement, the interest in parables, the apocalypse shared with Matthew, and the further occasional contacts, not only with Matthew, but with Mark as well (these latter are, I believe, most striking in just this section). Luke's sources in this section will then have been:—1st., oral tradition including parables, gathered as occasion offered; 2d., an apocalyptic "flyleaf," shared with Matthew; 3d., a collection of logia, briefly extracted, also shared with Matthew; and 4th., a document later used by Mark, also briefly extracted. This miscellaneous material appears in Proto-Luke at just the point where we should have expected to find it, immediately before the closely-knit Passion-narrative. So the hypothesis does fit the literary data; one would like to believe, too, that it fits the psychological conditions, and so escapes to some extent from the woodenness and artificiality which besets so much of our best endeavor in dealing with this most elusive problem.

THE INTERPRETATION OF ROMANS 6 17–18.

JAMES MOFFATT
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE clue to this passage lies in the words that immediately precede it in the argument of the apostle. *Οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε, ἤτοι ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην* (V. 16): "Know ye not, that to whom ye present yourselves as servants unto obedience, his servants ye are whom ye obey; whether of Sin unto (*εἰς θάνατον*, whose service ends in) death, or of Obedience unto righteousness?" Here Sin and Obedience are almost personified, as the rival lords of life. But whilst the apostle can speak indeed of an obedience to Sin as well as to the gospel, it is the higher obedience which is for him the real, and consequently there is an antithesis not simply between two forms of obedience but between Sin and Obedience. It is in the light of this sharp contrast that he develops the thought of 17–18; "but thanks be to God that, whereas ye were servants of Sin, ye became obedient (*ὑπηκούσατε δὲ*) from the heart to that form of teaching"—as our version has it, *εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς*—"which you received, and being made free (*ἐλευθερωθέντες*) from sin, ye became servants (*ἐδουλώθητε*) of righteousness." Here it may be noted that the verb *ὑπακούειν* is employed as in 10 16 (*ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*), although instead of *εὐαγγέλιον* he uses a special term *τύπος διδαχῆς*. But the point is that "obey" answers here to Obedience at the close of the preceding sentence. "Thank God, you now know the real obedience."

Then, as though to remind his readers that freedom from sin leads to utter devotion and service on the part of the Christian, Paul adds his favourite paradox, "being made free from Sin, ye became servants of Righteousness", and the rest of the paragraph (19—23) continues the thought. So far from ἐλευθερωθέντες κτλ. taking the point from ὑπηκούσατε, it sharpens the connection, by leading up to the obedience of faith. The δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας have been emancipated into a nobler δουλεία, and this transition is described first on its active (ὑπηκούσατε), then on its passive (ἐλευθερωθέντες) side.[1]

(1) In a recent paper Mr. C. J. Lattey proposes to begin the antithesis with ἐλευθερωθέντες (*Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1928, pp. 381—384), as though the apostle wrote, "Thanks be to God that whereas ye were slaves to sin and[2] had given hearty obedience to that form of teaching to which you were delivered, yet ye were freed from sin and became servants of righteousness." This implies that "form of teaching" is a phrase for the Mosaic Law. But the sense of διδαχή here is surely that of 16 17, where Paul speaks of the διδαχή which Christians have been taught, the most natural interpretation being[3], as Zahn remarks, "die im Glaubensgehorsam angenommene Lehre". To refer it to the Mosaic Law would require some specific hint in the context, which is not forthcoming. Besides, there is no reason to believe that Paul has here in mind specially Jewish Christians. When he describes the pagan and Jewish life of Christians, it is δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν (6 19).

Again, the words ἐκ καρδίας sound more natural as applied to the higher than to the lower obedience. Καλῶς εἶπεν, ὑπηκούσατε ἐκ καρδίας, as Chrysostom notes, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἠναγκάσθητε οὐδὲ ἐβιάσθητε,

[1] The active side recurs above in connection with the passive, παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ, ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας (v. 13).

[2] The δέ after ὑπηκούσατε ceases to be adversative, on this rendering, and does not become adversative until after ἐλευθερωθέντες.

[3] Originally this did not belong to Romans, but the inference is not affected, for it is a genuine Pauline note (Rom. 16 1–17, 1–20), with its warning against what is παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε.

ἀλλ' ἑκόντες κτλ. The only two parallels in the Pauline *corpus* occur in the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim. 1 5, 2 Tim. 2 22), where καθαρᾶς is added, I admit; but in 1 Peter 1 22 the very words ἐκ καρδίας come after ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας ("You have purified your souls in obeying the Truth... love one another from the heart"). This parallel is significant, whether or not the writer is supposed to have known the Pauline 'Romans.' It confirms the idea that ἐκ καρδίας in the Pauline style refers to the Christian attitude.

It is a nice point of interpretation, but the impression left upon my mind by the passage is not that the apostle dwells upon the habit of sinful men putting all their heart into evil before conversion, as though he were anticipating Luther's "pecca fortiter". Had this been so, we might have expected a counterbalancing phrase along with ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. The more natural explanation is that as soon as the apostle thinks about saving faith he touches the chord which rings later in 10 9—10 ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου . . . καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην. When he speaks about the pre-Christian state here, as he does in v. 20, he simply writes ὅτε δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας. It is of the Christian "obedience" that he adds,[4] "it is ἐκ καρδίας," to soften and explain as it were the implications of a term like ὑπακούειν as applied to the freedom of the faith[5] and the spontaneity of moral obedience in the Christian sphere.

(2) On either interpretation the difficulty of the phrase ὑπηκούσατε δὲ εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς remains. Kypke's suggestion[6] is still valid, that the sense is equivalent to ὑπηκούσατε εἰς τὸν τύπον τῆς διδαχῆς ὃς παρεδόθη ὑμῖν. His classical

[4] Similarly, after writing ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ he immediately explains, "This is but a human illustration" (v. 18, 19).

[5] It is not characteristic of the apostle to use καρδία of the lower life. He can say of immoral pagans, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν (1 24), but there is not enough evidence to show that he would have said, "God delivered (or abandoned) them to the form of teaching embodied in the Mosaic Law." Rather, to the Jew, he said (3 2), ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ as a sacred trust and privilege.

[6] *Observationes Sacrae* (1755), II, 167.

parallels for the style and the grammatical construction repay study, in the light of recent data dredged from the papyri. As a student today might observe, "We were given a course of lectures," so the passive turn of the apostle's language is intelligible enough. In the Oxyrhynchus Papyri (i. 102), for example, when a writer wishes to say that Diogenes had a piece of land ceded to him, he sets the fact down thus: *Διογένους τοῦ Πτολεμαίου παρακεχωρημένου . . . ἄρουραν.* The accepted use of *παραδίδωμι* and *παράδοσις* would tend to make this particular change of the active into the passive form not unnatural. And what is possible grammatically is probable on exegetical grounds, for the stress of the epistle from one aspect is surely on the need for moral discipline in the Christian life and upon the risk of depreciating the Old Testament Torah in the supposed interests of a "spiritual" religion.[7] Which is the point of the phrase about the *τύπον διδαχῆς.* The Authorised English Version was not incorrect when it rendered the words, "Which was delivered you," for while the Revised Version is more literal, "Whereunto ye were delivered" is not an English idiom, and good translation must take some account of idiom if it is to be more than pedantically accurate. That is a minor point, however; the more important question is the meaning of *τύπον διδαχῆς.* As I have already hinted, *διδαχή* is not neutral in Paul, and the argument of the epistle is in favour of interpreting the phrase as a reference to the Christian norm[8] or standard of life. Certainly *τύπον διδαχῆς* is a puzzling formation. In an earlier version[9] I had rendered it "You became cordially obedient to that type of teaching to which you were handed over." But to this there are two objections. One is, that

[7] This is well stated by Professor Ropes in *Studies in Early Christianity* (1928), pp. 353—365. Chrysostom explains *τύπον διδαχῆς* by *ὀρθῶς ζῆν καὶ μετὰ πολιτείας ἀρίστης.*

[8] The very term used in *S. D. F. Mori, Praelectiones* (1784, p. 76), I find; "est typus doctrinae aliquis normae vim habens, cui me accommodare debeo.... Vos traditi estis in hanc doctrinae disciplinam moralem, normam, i. e. facti estis huius disciplinae, normae, discipuli".

[9] *The Historical New Testament* (1901), p. 168.

it may suggest the absurd idea that the Roman Christians had adhered to some particular type of early Christian teaching, like Paulinism. The other is, that τύπος here does not mean "type" or "form" in our modern sense of the term. Calvin observes, "Quanquam vero Erasmus Formam vertere maluit post Veterem Interpretem, ego Typum relinquere coactus sum, qua voce usus est Paulus. Nisi quis forte Exemplar malit." "Exemplar" is certainly better than the Vulgate "Forma", but even a term like "exemplar" does not fit the meaning here, for τύπος had acquired the sense of "authoritative standard" in Greek usage as early as Plato. In the *Republic* (380 C), for example, we read εἰς τῶν περὶ θεοὺς νόμων καὶ τύπων, ἐν ᾧ δεήσει τούς τε λέγοντας λέγειν καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας ποιεῖν, where τύπος is almost our modern "principle" or "regulation." "Let this," says Plato, "be one of our rules and guiding principles (τύπων) with regard to the gods." That is, τύπος is akin to νόμος. Later instances of this usage of τύπος in the papyri are collected in Milligan and Moulton's *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (part vii., 1928, *s. v.*), which indicate an approximation to the sense of "plan" or "decision."[10] It is in the light of this usage that the apostle's remarkable phrase here should be interpreted. He is alluding to the rule or standard of belief which the Church before long called the Rule of Faith, taught to Christians as their authoritative guide for life, when they were baptized. In their divine ὑπακοή, they were "under" this, from the first; such is the implication of παρεδόθητε, coming after ὑπηκούσατε. Hence τύπος διδαχῆς seems to be one of the primitive expressions for that germ of the creed or standard of faith and morals which ruled the practice of the churches. Τύπος in short means "norm" rather than "form". Hence I have ventured to render the passage: "Thank God, though you did serve sin, you have rendered whole-hearted obedience to what you

[10] Again, when Plato speaks of the "principles of education" he writes (412B) οἱ τύποι τῆς παιδείας τε καὶ τροφῆς, just as Polybius later (xxii. 7 9) writes—δόντες δὲ τοὺς τύπους τούτους ὑπὲρ τῆς ὅλης διοικησέως, of political regulations.

were taught under the rule of faith; set free from sin, you have passed into the service of righteousness." I admit that "the rule of faith" is a slight paraphrase, but I still claim that the translation is only free because it seeks to be faithful to the spirit as well as to the letter of the original, and also because it attempts to avoid the use of English which would prove misleading. Such freedom does more justice to the Greek than any mere transliteration of a word like τύπος, for example.

THE QUESTION OF "UR-MARCUS" ONCE MORE

GEORGE A. BARTON
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
AND THE PHILADELPHIA DIVINITY SCHOOL

IT is not proposed in this paper to treat the documentary theory of the Second Gospel, either in the drastic form in which it was set forth by Wendling,[1] who thought that three hands had worked on the Gospel to bring it to its present form, or in that of Bacon,[2] who in 1908 thought that it was possible to separate in the Gospel a document, which goes back in substance to St. Peter, from the work of a Redactor who had access to Q, a theory more elaborately defended in his *Gospel of Mark*, New Haven, 1925. The writer's purpose is simpler and less speculative. He believes with Stanton[3] and N. P. Williams[4] that St. Luke's great omission of Mark 6 48—8 26 from his Gospel gives us objective evidence that the Gospel of St. Mark, as used by St. Luke, existed in a shorter form than that employed by the author of St. Matthew, and than that in which we have it.

This may seem a rash conclusion in view of the many weighty names of those who have rejected this view. The list includes, among English-speaking scholars, Sanday,[5] J. Vernon Bartlett,[6]

[1] E. Wendling, *Urmarcus*, 1905; also *Die Entstehung des Marcusevangeliums*, 1908.

[2] B. W. Bacon, *The Beginnings of Gospel Story*, New Haven, 1909.

[3] *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Vol. II, Cambridge, 1909, pp. 156ff.

[4] *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, Oxford, 1911, pp. 417—421.

[5] *Ibid*, pp. 24ff.

[6] *Ibid*, p. 324.

Streeter,[7], Rawlinson,[8] Easton[9], Vincent Taylor[10] and Montefiore.[11] To this list the name of Sir John Hawkins[12] should be added, who, on the basis of similarity of vocabulary, concluded that the material in Mk. 6 48–8 26 was written by the author of the rest of the Gospel and could not, therefore, have been written later. As will appear below, this consideration does not invalidate the solution of the problem which seems most probable to the writer.

Of all these Streeter has stated his objections to the theory that the passage in question was not in St. Luke's copy of St. Mark most succinctly and forcibly. He finds "two very formidable objections."[13] (1) The linguistic similarity of the language of the omitted section to that of the rest of St. Mark's Gospel which Sir John Hawkins had demonstrated; and (2) the difficulty of supposing that St. Mark circulated in two editions, since its lost ending was absent from both the copy employed by St. Luke and the copy employed by St. Matthew, and Streeter deems it improbable that the end of two different copies would have been accidentally torn off at the same place. As to the first of these objections, the fact of identity of language does not preclude the supposition that St. Mark wrote a Gospel about the year 50, which he afterward enlarged at Rome between 65 and 70 A. D. Streeter and Taylor[14] have made out a strong case for the supposition that St. Luke composed a Gospel-story, which they call L, into which he afterward incorporated the material of St. Mark's Gospel. It is just as easy to suppose that St. Mark tried his hand twice at Gospel-writing as to suppose that St. Luke did.

[7] *The Four Gospels*, New York, 1925, pp. 172ff.

[8] A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London, 1925, pp. xxxvi ff.

[9] B. S. Easton, *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, New York, 1926, pp. xvff.

[10] *Behind the Third Gospel*, Oxford, 1927, pp. 140 and 188f.

[11] C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, 2nd ed., London, 1927, Vol. II, pp. 446f.

[12] *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 64–66.

[13] *Op. cit.*, pp. 174f.

[14] Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, Oxford, 1926.

As to the second of Streeter's objections, the writer cannot agree that the ending of St. Mark's Gospel was lost until after St. Matthew's Gospel was written; and, since he believes that St. Luke's Gospel was written prior to the composition of St. Matthew's Gospel, *a fortiore* it was not lost before that. For the theory of Bacon,[15] that the original ending of St. Mark was deliberately suppressed, there seems to be no adequate evidence. Streeter's suggestion[16] that John 21 and the Gospel of Peter *may* give us a hint as to what the lost ending of Mark contained, does not commend itself. John 21 seems to be obviously a reworking of Luke 5 1–11. Burkitt's theory[17] that St. Mark's Gospel has lost about a third of its original contents, and that in its earliest form it contained the material now embodied in Acts 1—12, is almost purely speculative. In any event it could not be regarded as more than a bare possibility, and, even if true, would not account for certain phenomena of the narrative. The theory of my friend and pupil, Mr. Kevin,[18] that St. Paul has preserved the substance of the lost ending of St. Mark in 1 Cor. 15 3–8, seems to me unsatisfactory because St. Paul makes no mention of the appearance of Jesus first to the women, but makes the Epiphanies begin with that to St. Peter. Further, it is implied in St. Mark 16 1–8 that the Epiphanies began in Galilee, and to connect St. Paul's enumeration of the Epiphanies with St. Mark it would seem necessary to have more points of contact than one, viz., St. Peter. To the writer the most probable and satisfactory explanation of the contents of the lost ending of St. Mark's Gospel is that proposed by E. J. Goodspeed in 1905,[19] and reproduced in substance in his last book published in December, 1927.[20] This theory finds the lost ending of St. Mark in Matt. 28 9, 10, 16—19a,

[15] *The Gospel of Mark*, New Haven, 1925, ch. XV.

[16] *Op. cit.*, pp. 351ff.

[17] F. C. Burkitt, *Christian Beginnings*, London, 1924, pp. 82f.

[18] See this JOURNAL, Vol. XLV, pp. 81—103.

[19] *American Journal of Theology*, Vol. VIII, pp. 484—490.

[20] *New Solutions of New Testament Problems*, Chicago, 1927, pp. 116—122.

and 20. Burkitt recognizes that "in the story of the Passion Matthew follows Mark very closely, often word for word, and only differs from his source by inserting fresh matter from time to time, such as the dream of Pilate's wife and the guards at the tomb. All this matter seems to me of a legendary and unhistorical character."[21] Of a similar unhistorical character is the story of the bribing of the guards by the Jewish elders (Matt. 28 11—16). The trinitarian baptismal formula in v. 19b is also obviously a later addition, since in the early Apostolic Age they baptized simply "in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts 2 38) or "into the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 19 5). If we remove these portions of Matt. 28 9—20, we have a simple, natural, and satisfactory ending of St. Mark left. It recounts how the disciples went to Galilee, as the narrative of St. Mark implies that they should; how Jesus appeared to them there, and gave them their great commission. The theory recognizes, too, that the author of St. Matthew followed in the concluding portion of his narrative of the Passion the same method which he had pursued in the earlier portion of it.

The solution satisfies every known condition of the problem to such a degree that to reject it seems gratuitously to inject difficulties into the problem, unless there is some indubitable proof that the ending of St. Mark's Gospel was lost before the Gospel of St. Matthew was written. Streeter thinks he finds such proof in the fact that St. Luke's narrative, in ch. 24 1—8, seems to follow St. Mark 16 1—8, but after v. 8, it goes a way of its own. The assumption seems to be that it is safe to infer that St. Luke knew St. Mark's material only up to ch. 16 8. Is this inference justified? Dr. A. M. Perry showed in 1920[22] that St. Luke had access to a narrative of our Lord's Passion which differed radically from St. Mark, and which he preferred to St. Mark,—a source which ran parallel to the material contained in Mark chs. 11—16. Perry called this the "Jerusalem Source," believing that it was written at Jerusalem about the year 45 A. D. Streeter himself believes in such a source, only he makes it a part of that document which

[21] *Op. cit.*, p. 82.

[22] *The Sources of Luke's Passion-Narrative*, Chicago, 1920.

he believes St. Luke himself compiled at Caesarea abount 60 A. D. before he knew St. Mark's Gospel. According to Streeter and Vincent Taylor it was this document which St. Luke made the ground-work of his own Gospel, fitting the material of St. Mark into it. Supposing, now, that such a source existed, is it unlikely that it should agree with St. Mark's narrative in some details? Just as it is not improbable that both Mark and Q should sometimes record the same thing, so it certainly is not improbable that St. Mark and this early independent narrative of the Passion should run parallel. A careful comparison of Luke 24 1–8 with Mark 16 1–8 betrays a sufficient number of differences to make it possible that they may easily be independent versions of an early tradition. It seems to the writer, at all events, that there is here no clear evidence that the Gospel of St. Mark, as St. Luke knew it, had lost its ending. Streeter finds[23] four good and sufficient reasons for believing that Mark 6 48–8 26 were not in the copy which St. Luke employed. He accounts for it by supposing that a portion of the middle of St. Luke's roll of the Gospel had been torn out. Of course, that kind of an accident is possible, just as it is possible that St. Mark had a stroke of paralysis as he finished ch. 16 8 and never wrote any more; but it seems an improbable sort of accident. To the writer the simpler and more probable explanation is that St. Mark during his life-time issued two editions of his Gospel, and that St. Luke knew and used only the first and shorter of these.

If, on the basis of the omission by St. Luke of this long passage (Mk. 6 48–8 26), we conclude that there once circulated a shorter edition of St. Mark, the question naturally arises, were other parts of our present Mark also absent from this first edition? N. P. Williams held[24] that Ch. 13, the little apocalypse, was wanting in the first edition of St. Mark, and that this chapter was introduced in the second or third edition by St. Mark himself—a view which, so far as I know, has gained no adherents. A large

[23] *Op. cit.*, p. 176.
[24] *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 416ff.

number of scholars have adopted the theory of Colani and Weiffenbach that Mark 13 contains an early Jewish-Christian apocalypse, attributed to Jesus, interwoven with genuine words of our Lord. This apocalypse consisted of ch. 13 7, 8, 14—20, 24—27, and 30—31. It is mainly on v. 19 of this little apocalypse that scholars have relied for their proof that the Gospel was composed about 70 A. D. If the apocalypse originated in connection with the destruction of Jerusalem, and if there was an earlier edition of the Gospel, naturally the apocalypse could not have been in that earlier edition. But to the writer it seems evident from v. 14 that the apocalypse originated in the time of Caligula about 40 A. D.[25] It could well have been inserted in the first edition of the Gospel. Possibly in the second edition, issued after the war of 66—70 had begun, the phraseology of 13 19 was slightly modified. There seems no good reason, however, for supposing that the whole chapter may not have been in the first edition.

That there were in other sources other accounts of our Lord's discourse on the last things is made clear by a comparison of Luke 21 and Matt. 24 with Mk. 13. Perry[26] has recognized this, from a study of Luke 21, and a comparison of Matt. 24 with the corresponding chapters in the other two Synoptists, and suggests that the author of St. Matthew had still another source for some of his apocalyptic material. The topical method of this writer, however, makes the inference in his case more doubtful.[27] Similarly Vincent Taylor holds that St. Luke had a non-Marcan source for a considerable part of Luke 21, though he does not consider it a part of Proto-Luke.[28]

[25] Cf. τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως with Dan. 9 27 and the situation so graphically described by Josephus, *Antiquities*, xviii, 8, 1—9.

[26] *Op. cit.*, pp. 117f.

[27] Matthew, *e. g.*, has the equivalent of Mk. 13 9–13 in ch. 10 17–21. Luke, on the other hand, places a part of Matthew's eschatological discourse (Matt. 24 26–28 and 37–41) in ch. 17 23, 24, 37b, 34 and 35. Luke also places Matt. 24 43–51, in ch. 12 39, 40, 42–46, and ch. 13 28a. It is probable, therefore, that Matthew's discourse was compiled by the author of that Gospel.

[28] Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, Oxford, 1926, pp. 101—125.

There are other passages in St. Mark besides Ch. 6 48–8 26 which St. Luke omits.[29] They are Mark 1 5, 6,—a comment which St. Luke probably thought superfluous. His omission cannot be taken as evidence that these verses were not in his copy of St. Mark. He also omits Mark 4 33, 34, which St. Luke apparently regarded as an unnecessary detail. Mark 6 17–29—the account of the imprisonment and death of John the Baptist—St. Luke omits, because he already had an account of it (Luke 3 19, 20), which he had probably derived from another source, perhaps Q. Mk. 9 10–13 was too Jewish for St. Luke's purpose. The case is, however, different with Mark 9 28–29 and 43–48. It would seem that these passages would have appealed to St. Luke had he known them. We may, I think, assume that they were probably not in his copy. Of ch. 10 1–10 it is more difficult to speak with confidence. The subject-matter is the legality of divorce from the Jewish standpoint. Possibly St. Luke thought the argument too Jewish; or possibly he thought the counsel of perfection too high for Hellenistic readers. It seems unfair to him, though, to suppose that he would omit the passage for such a motive, and the question whether it were not really absent from his copy, should be left open. Mark 10 35–41—the request of James and John to occupy the chief positions of honor in the Kingdom—is of such a nature that it seems that St. Luke would have used it, had it been in his copy. We may conclude, I think, that it was not. Mark 11 12–14 and 20–22—the story of the cursing of the fig tree and its withering—would not appeal to St. Luke, as it does not to many a modern man, and may have been deliberately omitted by him. It was probably in St. Mark's Gospel from its earliest compilation, since it is a story that does not particularly glorify Jesus. Mark 11 24 St. Luke may also have purposely omitted, thinking that it would induce disappointments which might lead to unbelief. St. Luke's other omissions of St. Mark's material—Mark 13 10, 18, 27, 32; 14 26–28; 15 3–5—are all in por-

[29] This list of St. Luke's omissions of Marcan material is that of Streeter. Cf. *op. cit.*, p. 196.

tions of St. Mark to which St. Luke apparently had a parallel source which he preferred. His non-use of them does not imply that they were not in his edition of St. Mark. Of the 61 verses thus enumerated, which St. Luke omits, it can be plausibly argued that only 23 were wanting in St. Luke's edition of St. Mark.

Streeter has also compiled[30] a list of 24 verses in St. Mark which are not represented in St. Matthew's Gospel. They are Mk. 1 23–28—the casting out of a demon—which the author of Matthew perhaps omitted because he had chosen a more striking account of demon-expulsion (Mk. 8 28ff.)—the story of the legion of demons which entered into the Gadarene swine; Mk. 1 35–38—Jesus praying—is a passage which it is difficult to see why St. Matthew should omit except by accident; Mk. 4 21–24, to which, however, Matthew has similar material—Mt. 5 16; 10 26; 7 2; Mk. 6 30—the return of the Apostles to Jesus, the omission of which, because of Matthew's topical method, may have been accidental; Mt. 9 38–41—the casting out of demons by those not of the Apostolic company—a passage possibly omitted out of consideration for Church discipline; and Mk. 12 40–44—the incident of the widow's mite—possibly omitted so as not to discourage large givers. When the method of the author of our First Gospel is taken into account, his omission of these passages in no way implies that they were not in the copy of St. Mark's Gospel which he employed.

The conclusion to which we are led is, therefore, that St. Mark issued two editions of his Gospel. The first probably lacked the following passages which are in our present Gospel: chs. 6 48–8 26; 9 28, 29, 43–48; 10 1–10 and 35–41.

It seems probable from what the Book of Acts tells us of St. Mark that this earlier and shorter edition of his Gospel may have been issued in connection with the missionary work of the Church at Antioch. That Church sent out missionaries as early as the year 46 or 47 A. D., and St. Mark was, for a time, a member of its first missionary expedition (Acts 13 1–5 and 13). Later he accompanied

[30] *Op. cit.*, p. 196.

Barnabas on a mission, the first objective of which was Cyprus (Acts 15 39). In such missionary activities the need of some account of the life and teaching of our Lord would be made evident, and it does not seem too much to suppose that the first edition of this Gospel was written at that time. Later (61—63) St. Mark was with St. Paul at Rome (Col. 4 10); and while Papias, as quoted by Eusebius,[31] connects St. Mark with St. Peter, saying that he secured the material for his Gospel from that Apostle, Eusebius also quotes Clement of Alexandria[32] and Origen[33] as authorities for the statement that the Gospel of St. Mark was written at Rome. If our inferences from St. Luke's omissions justify us in believing that St. Mark issued two editions of his Gospel, this Patristic testimony would apply to the second edition of St. Mark. Professor Bacon has presented the arguments for the supposition that St. Mark was written at Rome with his usual skill and erudition.[34] We take all the evidence which he has collected as applying to the second and enlarged edition of our second Gospel. We conclude, therefore, that the first edition of St. Mark was issued at or near Antioch plus or minus 50 A. D.; the second edition at Rome, 65—70 A. D.[35]

[31] Eusebius, *EH*, iii, 39.

[32] *Ibid.*, vi, 14.

[33] *Ibid.*, vi, 25.

[34] *Is Mark a Roman Gospel*, Cambridge, Mass., 1919.

[35] The arguments of Bacon, *Gospel of Mark*, ch. XXIII, for a date as late as the reign of Domitian, do not seem to me convincing.

THE ROCKEFELLER-McCORMICK MANUSCRIPT

DONALD W. RIDDLE
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE materials for the study of the text of the New Testament were further enriched by the discovery in 1927 of a hitherto unknown manuscript by Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed. That the all too meagre resources of America in this respect were supplemented by the manuscript's being acquired by Mrs. Edith Rockefeller-McCormick of Chicago is also gratifying. The codex has been entrusted to the Department of New Testament and Early Christian Literature of the University of Chicago for investigation. Sufficient progress in research has been made that an announcement is now possible.

The Rockefeller-McCormick manuscript is a Greek New Testament complete with the exception of the Apocalypse. That is to say, it is a New Testament of the Eastern canon. It was early found to be related to the minuscule 38, which was given in 1269 by the Emperor Michael Paleologus to Saint Louis. The relationship made certain the 13th century date of the manuscript. It is written in a fine minuscule hand on 206 folios of vellum, the leaves measuring 12/19.5 centimetres. The writing is one column to the page, distributing the text normally 42 lines to the column in the Gospels, 36 lines elsewhere. The folios are bound in 30 quires of variable numbers of leaves, usually 6 or 8, sometimes 5 and 7. There is one magnificent purple leaf. The binding is in bad condition, but such as it is it secures the text between two

beautiful silver covers. Several leaves of the manuscript have become badly wrinkled, but fortunately practically every word of the text is legible.

Originally the manuscript discovered by Professor Goodspeed contained not less than 218 folios, but 12 leaves have been lost, leaving lacunae as follows: Matthew 9_{19}—10_{1}; 20_{20}—21_{15}; Luke 4_{44}—5_{33}; 23_{38}—24_{41}; John 2_{3}—4_{10} (where two folios are missing); Acts 1_{1}—$_{10}$ (a leaf which must also have contained the decorative heading of the book); 7_{58}—9_{3} (where two folios are missing); 16_{39}—17_{3}; and 19_{5}—20_{7}; and, finally, 1 Timothy 2_{15}—3_{3}. Of the 206 leaves now contained in the manuscript 7 are not of the same vellum and hand as the original, but represent attempts to supply missing folios. These include two (duplicate) texts of Matthew 1_{1}—$_{8}$, leaving space for decorations, and text of Matthew 1_{8}—$_{17}$; Luke 2_{27}—3_{9}; 9_{36}—10_{6}; 2 Peter 3_{11}—$_{18}$ (this folio contains also extraneous matter); and Jude $_{14}$-Romans 1_{26}. In each case the difference of hand and materials is evident, as is the case also with the character of the text.

It is possible that the manuscript may originally have been still more extensive. It may have been one of those which contained the Psalter. This, however, is a problem toward which no attitude may be assumed until additional evidence is available.

The most outstanding feature of the newly discovered New Testament is a wealth of Byzantine illuminations, which abound in the richest profusion. A New Testament with 14 miniatures has usually been regarded as richly decorated, and one with 34 has been celebrated as in its own class in this respect. But the recent acquisition of Mrs. Rockefeller-McCormick possesses no less than 98 separate miniatures, including the sumptuous decoration on the verso of the purple folio, decorations at the heading of books, portraits of evangelists and apostolic writers, and illustrations of the narratives of the Gospels and Acts. Further, as evidence of the unique worth of the manuscript in this respect, it appears from the computation of the distribution of lines in the missing or supplied folios that in its original form this New

Testament had 21 miniatures above its present number, making a total of 119.[1]

In content the manuscript has the New Testament completely, with the exception of the Apocalypse. It contains the ending of Mark which is usual in minuscules, as well as the story of the woman taken in adultery. In the latter instance, however, the point at which the section begins is marked in the margin, indicating that the pericope was known to have peculiar character. There is a hiatus in the text from John 8 20—9 1 which differs from the lacunae previously identified in that it occurs within a column with no evidence that the loss was apparent to the scribe. Clearly this is no case of homoioteleuton. It is possible that the scribe's exemplar lacked these verses.

The entire codex was written by a single scribe in an exquisite minuscule hand. The ink is of exceptional quality. The writing was done with great care. This is evident from the fact that while no less than 14 hands may be identified as having written for one or another purpose upon the pages of the manuscript, the amount of marginal or other correction is astonishingly slight. In the few cases where such appears they suggest that the errors were of the eye or ear, without involving significant misreadings. Indeed, so carefully was the text written that there is no evidence of the work of a διορθωτής; the few corrections which appear were almost always made by the scribe himself.

The others who have put pen to the same vellum have done so at different times for various purposes. One supplied the duplicate texts of the beginning of Matthew and the lacuna at Luke 2 27—3 9. Another supplied text for the lacuna at Luke 9 36—10 6 and the extraneous material which appears at the end of Hebrews. A third supplied the closing verses of 2 Peter and filled space originally occupied by a portrait of John with a summary of 1 John, and supplied Jude 14—25 and Romans 1 1—26. The lesson notes and headings of Acts and the Catholic Epistles are

[1] The iconography of the Rockefeller-McCormick manuscript and the date of its covers are being investigated by Dr. Harold R. Willoughby of the University of Chicago.

by a distinct hand. There are notes at the conclusion of Mark and of Romans by a later hand, a small number of marginal glosses, the few marginal corrections, a note on an early folio, and a still undeciphered note on the final leaf.

The manuscript is equipped in the Gospels and Acts-Catholics with lesson numbers and certain titles. While they seem to be the usual sections there is a certain amount of variation from the standard canons. Such quire numbers as appear are in the upper right hand corners; the original numbers have occasionally been altered. Acts carries its own quire numbers. There are no numbers nor lesson sections whatever in the Pauline letters.

As a feature of unusual importance it may be mentioned that this manuscript is one of the few which concludes the Epistle to the Romans with the benediction of 16 24, transferring the doxology of Romans 16 25—27 to the end of chapter 14. Its evidence will be useful in the solution of a moot problem.[2]

It is clear that the Rockefeller-McCormick manuscript is a New Testament properly so-called, not a lectionary. The distinction is clear as it is noted that in the Gospels, as is usually the case, the lesson numbers according to the tables of canons are in the margin, with the significant exception of cases on folios which have been inserted to supply texts missing at lacunae. Here the lesson notes (τέλος, ἀρχὴ) appear not in the margin but in the text, demonstrating that these folios were copied from a lectionary. In Acts it is usual for the lesson notes to appear in the text, and in the Catholic Epistles the practice is variable. In the letters of Paul lesson notes are entirely absent.

The vital matter in the notation of a newly available manuscript of the New Testament is, of course, the character of its text. In the present instance value obviously accrues in the fact that the codex is a New Testament, not merely a Gospels text, as is so much more common. But even more important than the extent of the text is the question of its character. As a rule, not much is expected of a minuscule manuscript, since the type of script is itself an indication of late date, and since textual methods have

[2] Lake, *The Earlier Epistles of Paul* (London, 1911), 335—346.

demonstrated conclusively that the critical text of the New Testament is basically to be constructed from the uncial manuscripts. Consequently, as Kenyon remarks,[3] notability in a minuscule manuscript is chiefly to be achieved by departure from the normal type. That is to say, since minuscules in the main conform to the type of text printed by Erasmus and edited in several forms as the so-called "received text," elements of value in this type of manuscript are those readings which forsake this norm and agree with the types of text represented in the uncials. Briefly, the most valuable readings are those which agree with the so-called "neutral," "Alexandrian," or "Western" families, represented, as textual scholars have determined, by codices ℵBCDLWΘ (and minuscules approaching in value 33).[4] The discrimination of textual tendencies is a highly technical matter, but since a thoroughly objective technique has been worked out, it is not difficult to determine the relationship and character of a new manuscript.

A study of the text of the Rockefeller-McCormick Manuscript discovers that while, as might be expected, the text is mainly Byzantine, the departures from this type in agreement with the critical text are unusually numerous and therefore highly significant.

Significant readings of the newly discovered manuscript may be illustrated by a few examples. The reading in Mt. 2 12, that the magi "saw," rather than "found" the child Jesus is in agreement with critical texts, but it happens to be one which is shared by many minuscules. In Mt. 3 8 the singular number in the words "fruit worthy" (of repentance) rather than the plural is one of the decisive readings of MSS B and W with which the MS agrees.[5] The use of the preposition εἰς for ἐπὶ in Mt. 5 39 is a peculiarity of ℵ, B, and our MS. On the other hand, the word "friends" for

[3] Kenyon, *Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London, 1912), 129.

[4] *ibid.*, 332ff.

[5] Identification of MSS indicated by symbols may be made by using Kenyon's handbook or Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig, 1900).

"brothers" in Mt. 5 47 is a distinctly Western variant, found in EKLDWΘ. When the MS reads in Mt. 7 27 "by what measure you measure it shall be measured" (rather than "measured against") it agrees with the best family of texts formed by ℵBEGKLMSUVXΔΠW, which are followed by the critical editions. In Mt. 11 16 the word παιδίοις rather than the diminutive παιδαρίοις is read by our MS and by ℵBCDEGKLMSXZΔΠWΘ (Θ, however, has an insignificant difference in orthography). In Mt. 12 10 the aorist infinitive of the verb "to heal" is read by ℵDLW, while the present infinitive is read by BCEGKM. Now, Westcott and Hort, strongly influenced by B, discard the former as a Western variant, but Tischendorf prefers it. Our MS has the reading adopted by Tischendorf.

The readings of Matthew may serve also to illustrate the alignment of the Rockefeller-McCormick MS with some of the important minuscules. In this phenomenon the MSS numbered 33, the group 1—118—131—209, and the so-called Ferrar group of 13—69—124—346 et al. are the most significant. Our MS departs from the usual Erasmian text to agree with 33 in a number of cases, as for example: In Mt. 16 11 the critical text reads, "How is it that you do not perceive that I did not speak to you concerning loaves? But beware of the yeast of the Pharisees and Sadducees." The usual minuscule text has "how is it that you do not perceive that I did not speak to you about bread to beware of the yeast of the Pharisees and Sadducees?" But our MS, with 33 and 346, reads the infinitive of the verb and then adds the imperative. Again, in Mt. 22 37 the form ἔφη for εἶπεν is read by our MS and by 33, not to mention ℵBL, which makes a highly respectable grouping. πολυτίμου is read for βαρυτίμου in Mt. 26 7. To be sure, the latter, read by BΓΔ, is preferred by Westcott and Hort. But Tischendorf adopts the former, which has the authority of ℵADLMPΘ and of 33 and 137.

Of significant readings in the Markan Gospel, the following may be cited: πάντοθεν is read for πανταχόθεν in 1 45 with ℵABCDKLMSΔΠWΘ and 1, 33, 118, 131,157, 209, 238—a goodly company, certainly. Almost as extensive a grouping is followed

(ℵABCDKLMΔW and 1, 33, 124) in 5 18, as ἐμβαίνοντος is read for ἐμβάντος. The form of the subjunctive γνοῖ for γνῷ is read in 5 43, agreeing with ABDL against ℵCΔΠW. It may be noted that in Mark the association of our MS with valuable minuscules is obvious. Most of the examples cited exhibit such relationship. Some do so strikingly. For example, in 1 13 the words ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ are omitted, as in 1, 69, 124, 131, 209. In 3 8 Ἰουδαίας is read for Ἰδουμαίας, with 1, 131, 209. In 6 51 ἐξεπλήσσοντο is used rather than ἐξίσταντο, as in 1, 118, 209. Perhaps the best example of this phenomenon is the form of 10 20, 21; the rich youth adds to the statement that he had observed the commandments the question, "What yet do I lack?" and the MS causes Jesus to add to his reply, "If you wish to be perfect." Both these readings are supported by the MSS KMNΠWΘ and 13—69—124—136 (the so-called Ferrar Group).

Enough readings from the Gospels have been reported so that few others need be mentioned. A few may not be amiss, however. Luke 3 2 reads "high priest" (singular) with a large group inclusive of ℵBCDLWΘ. Luke's form of the Lord's Prayer (11 3) has δὸς for δίδου and σήμερον for τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, a Western reading, with D, 2, 28, 71, 106, 300. A curious reading is "You have been faithful in a good (rather than "little") thing" in the parable of the minae (19 7). John 1 28 has Βηθανία for Βηθαβάρα, with an excellent group including the recently available W and Θ. In the story of Lazarus a curious and rare phenomenon occurs. John 11 41 in critical texts reads, "They took away the stone." The Erasmian texts add, "where the dead man was lying." Our MS has, "They took away the stone where he was (οὗ ἦν), adding its evidence to the group AKΠ, 1, 22, 249. Another mixed reading occurs in John 12 13, where to the clearly Syrian ἔκραζον there is added the participle λέγοντες, which is read by ℵADKΘXΠ. Again, in John 19 3 our MS reads instead of the simple verb "they began to say to him," as do ℵBLUXΔΠWO, 13, 33, 69, 106, 124.

There are many interesting features in the text of Acts. The significance of the addition of ἐν before τῷ σπέρματί in 3 25 is not in the preposition, but in the alignment of the reading with ℵABCD

E (Greek) P. Similarly, ἀπὸ for ὑπὸ in 4 36 means more than a choice of synonymous terms. In 7 36 τῇ Αἰγύπτου is read for γῇ Αἰγύπτου, as by BC and a group of minuscules. In 18 5 εἶναι is read before τὸν Χριστὸν, with the best uncials and a group of minuscules. In 28 1 the addition of οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον apparently attests the influence of L, or at least the textual tendency represented by this valuable uncial. Similarly, ἤχθημεν for ἀπήχθημεν illustrates the influence of the tendency characterizing 33 and a strong group of minuscules.

In Acts another interesting textual phenomenon occurs with significant frequency. There are many readings of the usual minuscule texts which are omitted from our MS. The omissions are hardly of the character identified in the Westcott and Hort edition as "Western non-interpolations," but they furnish an index to some features of the manuscript's character. For example, αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε, which concludes 7 37 in the traditional text, is omitted, as it is by ℵAB and others. In chapter 9, verses 5 and 6, our MS reads as does the critical text, omitting the reading of the so-called textus receptus. In the same section there are other significant omissions from 9 18 and 10 6, 21. Acts 15 34 is omitted entirely, as in the critical text. Examples might readily be extended.

The text of the Catholic Epistles is perhaps the least distinguished of all sections of the codex. While minor agreements with better MSS might be cited, it will suffice at this point to call attention to 1 John 2 23, where "He who confesses the son has the Father also" is added, as in the critical text, with ℵABCP. The famous reference to the Three Heavenly Witnesses is, of course, lacking.

On the other hand, the letters of Paul in our manuscript are full of interesting readings. Among the many may be mentioned θεοῦ for Χριστοῦ in Romans 8 35, τῷ κυρίῳ for τῷ καίρῳ in Romans 12 11, and the omission of ἐξουσίαι from Romans 13 1. In 1 Corinthians decidedly the most interesting features occur in the discussion of the Lord's Supper in ch. 11. Here, where a matter of ritual is concerned, it might be expected that a minuscule MS would agree with the type of text normative in its day. But our

MS four times abandons the Erasmian text to agree with the critical. It omits λάβετε, φάγετε with ℵABC*DEFG, 3, 17, 23*, 31, 46*, 57, 67**, 70, 71, 73, 178.[6] Twice, in verses 25, 26, it reads ἐὰν for ἄν, with ℵBC, 17. It omits τοῦτο with ℵ*ABC*D*FG, 17, 46, 80, 109. It adds τοῦ before αἵματος with ℵABCDEFGKLP. Agreements with such eminent groupings are still more numerous in Ephesians. For instance, 1 1, transpose so as to read Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. 1 3, before Χριστῷ add ἐν. 1 6, end, add υἱῷ αὐτοῦ. 1 18, καρδίας for διανοίας. 2 17, before καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς add καὶ εἰρήνη. 3 9, οἰκονομία for κοινωνία. 5 9, φωτὸς for πνεύματος. 6 19, δοθῇ for δωθείη. Space permits attention to be called to one further instance only; in Philippians 1 16, 17 the balance of clauses furnishes an indication of the classification of a MS; here our manuscript is in agreement with a long list of uncials and minuscules which are authorities for the critical text. There is an interesting reading in Colossians 1 6. Hebrews, with which the codex closes, also has readings of distinction, such as κομισάμενοι for λάβοντες in 11 13, and ζόφῳ for σκότῳ in 12 18.

On the basis of Kenyon's criterion, namely, that notability in a minuscule is achieved by departure from type, the data exhibited above certainly suggest that the Rockefeller-McCormick MS forsakes the textus receptus for the readings of the critical text in numerous significant cases. Of course the readings here cited are a small fraction of the total various readings. Nor is it to be supposed that they are necessarily the most important. They have been chosen merely because they conveniently illustrate the manner in which variant readings fall into the several classes which are specifically identified by textual critics. Further research, it is expected, will evaluate all the readings which characterize the text of the manuscript, and determine the place of this text in the growth of the text of the New Testament.[7]

[6] These statistics are cited from the 8th edition of Tischendorf. References may be equated with the systems of Gregory and von Soden by consulting Gregory, *Die Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig, 1908), 185ff.

[7] This study will be generalized in a forthcoming book.

HOSEA'S MESSAGE AND MARRIAGE[1]

L. W. BATTEN
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE aim of the modern biographer quite generally seems to be to strip the saints of their halo. The latest conspicuous case is that of Charles Dickens. For a century Dickens was regarded not only as one of the greatest of English novelists, but also as an upright and honorable man. But now appears Mr. Bechhofer-Roberts with his "This Side Idolatry," a biography in the form of a novel, in which he portrays Dickens as "a selfish, blustering, coarsely humorous, impressionable, but heartless vulgarian, without a suggestion of genius,"[2] and where challenged, as he has been from many quarters, he stands by his charges, and claims to rout all critics by irrefutable evidence. In my paper I shall be privileged to follow an opposite and more kindly course, and hope to put a bit of long overdue halo about the head of one heretofore adjudged worthy of stoning for her sins. I refer to Gomer-bath-Diblaim, and may as well assert at the outset that *ut ego opinor* the charge of adultery standing against her for so many centuries, cannot be sustained by the available evidence, so that on the basis of the information contained in his book Hosea could not get a decree of divorce in the state of New York, however easy it might be at Reno or Paris.

[1] Presidential Address delivered before the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis at a meeting held at The Biblical Seminary, New York City, December 27, 1928.

[2] *Saturday Review of Literature,* Oct. 20, 1928.

Now in a proper court it is necessary not only to hear the testimony of the witnesses, but also to weigh carefully their credibility. For it is clear that if witnesses contradict each other, they cannot both be right. The difficult problem then arises to determine whether one or the other is telling the truth, or speaks from competent knowledge. I propose a rehearing of the case of Hosea *vs.* Gomer, or, rather I should put it, the interpreters of Hosea *vs.* Gomer, and see what can be learned by a critical sifting of all the testimony available.

I say *all* the testimony advisedly, for it is the common practice to base the verdict against Gomer only on the first three chapters of Hosea's book. And it may be said now that the evidence available here presents grave difficulties, for a great variety of interpretations have been educed from it, no one of which has been generally acclaimed as satisfactory. I venture to hope that some light may be shed on this perplexing problem by first calling to the stand a witness who has heretofore sat silently in the back of the court room, the witness who will limit himself to the genuine Hosean prophecies in cc. 4—14. In the case of this witness we may rely upon his words confidently, for nobody distrusts him. It is true that most scholars would presumably say that while his testimony is unquestionably trustworthy, nevertheless for the case at issue it is quite irrelevant. So far as direct testimony is concerned that is true. The witness reveals no information about the conditions of Hosea's married life. But in this self-constituted court we are not hampered, as all our American courts are, by antiquated and irrational rules about the admissibility of evidence. We want to find what the truth is, and will welcome every scrap of evidence that may aid our quest.

In the examination of cc. 4—14 it is necessary to exclude only two main passages, 11 8—11 and 14 2-10, to which I shall return later. What we wish to learn from this witness is at first testimony showing Hosea's position in regard to the fate of Israel and the cause of that fate.

On these points the testimony is unmistakable. Our witness deposes that the doom of the nation of Israel is final and irre-

vocable. Doubtful as the text often is, there is no question as to the import of Hosea's words.

The witness need cite only a few passages. First we hear:

> I am like a lion unto Ephraim,
> And like a young lion to the house of Israel[3]
> I verily will tear and get me away,
> I will seize, and there is none can rescue (5 14).

As Harper says of this passage it is "the strongest possible metaphor of destruction" (I. C. C.).

Again our witness testifies that Hosea clearly perceives the exile as the fate of Israel:

> They shall not abide in Jahveh's land,[4]
> But Ephraim shall return to Egypt,
> And in Assyria they shall eat the unclean (9 3).

Finally the witness will cite the last message of Hosea to his doomed nation:

> Samaria is surely guilty,
> For she has rebelled against her God.
> They will fall by the sword,
> Their children be dashed in pieces,
> And their pregnant women ripped up (14 1).

It would be easy to elicit much more evidence of the same tenor, but enough has been presented to show that in the oracles which may confidently be credited to Hosea there is an unqualified forecast of disaster; and were we to search ever so diligently we could find no hint of a less ominous fate. How could there be any other note, unless we assume that a sane man, to say nothing of a prophet of God, could with the same breath blow both hot and cold? Moreover, it is highly probable that Hosea's

[3] I follow those like Harper and Marti in substituting Israel for Judah. If the text is sound Hosea takes quite a different attitude towards the fate of Judah than the later prophet who added such passages as 1 7. But it is not probable that Hosea was concerned with the fate of the Southern Kingdom. The conditions of Israel were enough to engross his attention.

[4] Marti pronounces this line a gloss, but that is immaterial for my purpose, for the exile is clear without it.

prophecies extend over practically the whole of that dark era which marked the close of Israel's life as a nation, reaching perhaps nearly or quite to the siege and fall of Samaria in 722 B. C. And the ominous messages do not mark any single period of the prophetic career, but run through the whole as a leading motive. Further it seems pretty evident that the emphasis on Israel's dire fate increases as the prophet approaches the end of his ministry.

Now we are ready to hear the witness' testimony as to the cause of Israel's plight. To a Hebrew prophet of this age the cause could only be sin, but to Hosea the sins of Israel fall into three categories, ethical, political and religious. In sharp contrast to what we find in Amos, comparatively little is found about Israel's immorality, though there is enough to show that Hosea was not blind to the people's vice, nor unaware of its consequences. There was a prevalence of gross evils, stealing, killing, lying, adultery and drunkenness, and the prophet was not indifferent to such wrongs; but he castigates the nation still more sharply for their political blunders. He points out their stupidity in their handling of both national and international problems. For they had dared to set up dynasties and to throw them down without the counsel of God, and they had made futile alliances with one power after another, each equally disastrous in its consequences, and each equally repugnant to their God.

But the supreme sin of Israel as Hosea sees it is in the religious field, and consists of their infidelity to their God. Like Elijah Hosea stands squarely for the religion of Jahveh without addition or admixture, but the people are idolaters. Whatever Jeroboam I had intended when he established the calf worship as the distinctive feature of the religion of his kingdom, and whatever that cult meant to the ordinary man of the prophet's day, to Hosea it was rank idolatry. To the mind of this prophet, while there was much religion in Israel, it was at best a gross corruption of the pure religion of Jahveh, and so was worthless.

Our witness could cite more testimony on this point than we should have the patience to hear just now, so we will restrict him

to a few passages which will serve as samples. This one is pretty plain:

> Ephraim is a worshipper of idols,
> He has set up for him a fat ox.
> They have grossly apostatized,
> They love shame more than glory[5] (4 17f).

This one shows the prophet's attitude towards the bovine cult:

> I spurn thy calf, O Samaria,
> My anger blazes against it.
> A workman made it,
> And it is not a god;
> And so Samaria's calf
> Shall become fragments (8 5, 6).

As a part of the persistent denunciation of Israel as an idolatrous nation we find passages more nearly relevant to the subject of Hosea's marriage, for the prophet frequently uses the figure of illicit sex relations to express Israel's infidelity to Jahveh. Thus:

> My people inquire of their wood,
> And their staff gives them answer.
> For a spirit of whoredom leads them astray,
> And they practice adultery against their God (4 12).

> Thou hast played the harlot, Ephraim;
> Israel has made himself unclean (5 3).

> To Jahveh they have been unfaithful,
> For they have borne bastard sons (5 7).

> Do not rejoice, O Israel,
> Exult not like the peoples;
> For thou turnedst from God to harlotry,
> Thou hast loved the prostitute's wage (9 1).

It is pertinent to ask whence Hosea derived that figure. According to the usual view of the prophet's life, it came inevitably from his own unhappy experience. But surely that is not a necessary inference. That is, if we did not assume a marital tragedy, we should not have to invent one to account for the me-

[5] For the most part, I follow here the rendering of Powis-Smith. A part of the text is corrupt, but the general trend is unmistakable.

faphor. The following passage shows that Hosea was quite aware to the existence of sexual vice outside of his own household:

> Your daughters play the harlot,
> And your daughters-in-law commit adultery;
> For yourselves company with harlots,
> And sacrifice with prostitutes (4 13 f.).

I think we would all agree that were a prophet today to compare backsliders to the faithless in marriage, we should not dream of inferring that his figure was due to domestic troubles of his own. On the contrary such personal pain would, by a true prophet, never be revealed to his audience.

It is expedient to note here a marked characteristic of Hosea's utterances. Invariably he is singularly impersonal. His favorite course is to represent Jahveh as the speaker. However microscopically we scan the oracles we find no word which throws a single beam of light on the prophet's person or history. It is not likely therefore that he would break his habitual reserve and lift the veil only to disclose what would be the deepest pain of his life. As a matter of fact the inference from the prophecies is that Hosea's married life was a happy one. The comparison of wicked Israel to an adulterous wife shows that Hosea had a high conception of the duty of marital fidelity, and his idea of faithfulness would naturally come from what he had seen in his own helpmeet.

To return once more and for the last time to the witness patiently waiting on the stand, we will seek what information he has about Jahveh's attitude towards Israel. The importance of this evidence is apparent. It is reiterated over and over again that Hosea is the exponent of a God of love. It is often urged, as by my esteemed friend Professor Bewer, at whose feet I always rejoice to sit, that Hosea's conception of God's love was derived from his own bitter experience. God directed him to love a bad woman and by obedience to this command he discovered that God loved a bad people, and his mission was henceforward to proclaim that love. There may remain doubt, even after my ex-

position is complete, about what orders Hosea received from on high, but there is no doubt as to what Hosea actually said in the part now under consideration, and we will let the witness speak.

First of all he declares in unmistakable language that love was the motive which led God to take Israel under his protecting wings at the beginning. I quote in part the beautiful passage with which we are all familiar:

> When Israel was a child, then I loved him,
> And from Egypt I called him to be my son.[6]
> I myself taught Ephraim to walk.
> I took him up in my arms,
> With easy lines I led him,
> With cords of love.
> I was one taking the bit from his jaws
> And I bent down and fed him (11 1–4).

Hosea shows clearly enough and often enough, and this passage if read in full would show that the idea is brought out here, that Israel did not respond to this love, and it is not an unreasonable inference that he would imply that even God could not maintain a one-sided love through all the centuries of Israel's history. It is not a necessary inference that because the seer holds that God loved the innocent infant, he must still love the deeply guilty adult. That point, however, is not to be pressed now, for it may be admitted that the position is tenable, so far as this one utterance goes, that Hosea conceives God as still loving his wayward people. It is certain though that the prophet never says so explicitly or implicitly, but that he does say much of quite another tenor. Listen to our witness:

[6] Harper rejects the word "son" on the ground that Hosea always employs the figure of the wife for Israel, though in another place the figure of the son is accepted (cf. pp. cli and 362, I. C. C.). Marti reads "his children," and that would correspond to the place of Israel in C. 2. At the Egyptian period Israel is conceived as too young to be the mother of many sons, and the rest of the passage shows that Israel is pictured as a helpless infant. If Harper's argument were valid, the inference would be that the passage is not Hosean. The conception of Israel as Jahveh's son would be natural in view of Ex. 4 22 (J.).

With flocks and herds they shall go
To seek Jahveh, but shall not find him;
He has withdrawn from them (5 6).

And again:

Therefore will I hew them by the prophets,
Slay them by the words of my mouth (6 5).

Their wickedness is in Gilgal,
So there I came to hate them.
On account of their evil deeds,
I will drive them from my house.
I will never again love them,
Since all their princes are rebels (9 15).

Once more:

Ephraim gave bitter provocation,
For blood guilt remains upon him,
And his shame will his Lord requite (12 14).

And finally:

I will be to them like a lion,
Like a leopard by the road will I lurk.
I will meet them like a bereaved bear,
I will tear the ribs from their chests.
I will devour them there like a lion,
And tear them like a wild beast (13 7 f.).

It is true that the beast of prey does love his victim's flesh, but his affection goes no further. If the prophet had in mind a God of love, he was most unhappy in his metaphors.

The conception of Hosea as an evangelical prophet, depicting a loving God concerned to save the sinners rather than the righteous, is very pleasant to contemplate, but willing as I am, I fail to find any such idea in the testimony of our witness, and I have endeavoured to induce him to disclose all that he knows bearing on that topic. Whether we can find the idea elsewhere is another matter, but if my interpretation thus far is sound I fear we can no longer search very hopefully, for a prophet must be deemed reasonably consistent.

I referred to two passages, 11 8—11 and 14 2—10, which have been left out of the testimony. I need say no more than that as

generally recognized, these along with other small bits here and there are clearly later additions. For their tenor is quite different from the other oracles and they definitely predict a return from the exile. Hosea probably lived to see his direful forecasts fulfilled to the letter, but he did not live long enough to witness any conditions on which the most optimistic observer could base an expectation of a return of the exiles to their native land. That was left for the devout dreamers of a much later day.

The way is now clear to undertake the confessedly difficult task of examining the more direct testimony found in Cc. 1—3. We may classify this material in either one of two ways. On a literary basis Cc. 1 and 3 belong together in sharp contrast to C. 2. But on a basis much more suitable to our purpose, we must classify according to the tenor of the passages, and we have then also two groups, but quite different groups; for with C. 1 1—9 we must connect 2 4—15, and with C. 3 the rest of C. 2, i. e., vv. 1—3, 16—25.

We begin with a study of the second group, and ask our witness to cite in full the original form of C. 1 1—9.

> The beginning of Jahveh's speaking with Hosea. And Jahveh said to Hosea, take thyself a wife, so he took Gomer-bath-Diblaim. And she conceived and bore him a son. And Jahveh said to him, name him Jezreel, for shortly I will punish the house of Jehu for the blood of Jezreel and bring to an end the dominion of Israel.
>
> And again she conceived and bore a daughter. And he said to him, name her Lo-ruhamah, for I no longer have compassion on the house of Israel that I can grant them forgiveness.
>
> When she had weaned Lo-ruhamah, she conceived again and bore a son. And he said, name him Lo-ammi, for they are not my people, nor am I their God.

It will be noticed that I accept the nearly unanimous verdict of both the traditional and liberal schools that the phrase qualifying *wife*, "of whoredoms and children of whoredoms" is a clumsy gloss. In any case it is difficult to make it mean that Hosea was to marry an adulterous woman, and remain her husband while she bears a brood of illegitimate children.[7]

Even a cursory examination of the passage shows plainly that

[7] v. 5 is also deemed an amplification.

while biographical in form, the motive of the story is wholly prophetic. Hosea names each child so that the name carries a prophetic message to Israel, thus giving us a perfect parallel to the cases in Isaiah. Neither prophet was concerned with the story of his domestic life, but both use that as a means of driving home the word of God to the nation.

Again, we note that the prophetic message in Hosea's names is one of punishment, of the rejection of Israel by their God so complete that pardon is no longer possible. God is utterly hostile to Israel. He will no longer recognize them as his people. Therefore the essential idea of the passage is in exact agreement with the evidence on this point already found in Cc. 4—14, and thus there is no ground to question its authenticity.

It is necessary to emphasize another point in this passage. Study it minutely as we will, we can in the text itself find no hint of anything abnormal in the family life of the prophet; as a source for scandal it is as barren as the old time register of births in the family Bible. It is true that the motive is the prophetic significance of the names of the children, and not their parentage, but there is not the slightest suggestion that Gomer ever had been or ever would be any other than a virtuous woman. So to get such a character for her as was deemed necessary, the ancient step was to add the clumsy gloss, while the modern is to read into the story what it clearly lacks. Thus Harper did not hesitate to declare that all three children were illegitimate. He apparently realized a difficulty in the record of Jezreel, plainly stating that Gomer bore her first son "to him," i. e. Hosea. He did try in a note to cast a bit of doubt on that obstinate snag "to him," but found the textual evidence too slender to serve as a prop for his theory.

Seeing that position a little too raw others have modified it, and claim to discover evidence that while the first two children may have had an honest mother, Hosea himself knew that it was unhappily otherwise in the case of the third child, and so he gave him the name Lo-ammi, and that means *not my kin*. That interpretation quite ignores the fact that the purpose of the names

was not personal, but prophetic. The prophecy did not come from the names, but the names were chosen to express the prophetic message. God directs the seer to name his daughter Lo-ruhamah, unloved, not to show that the father does not love his wife or child, but to show that God does not love Israel. Similarly the name Lo-ammi is not given to indicate a rift between father and son, but to proclaim the spanless breach between God and Israel. The meaning assigned to the word in this interpretation is quite impossible in view of the antithesis: "they are not my people, nor am I their God." To get a bad character for Gomer this must be changed to read: "they are not my sons, nor am I their father."[8]

We turn now to the other passage of this group, closely related in tenor, 2 4—15, aptly titled in the Powis-Smith translation, "Denunciation of Israel as a faithless wife." It is worth while to ask the witness to give it in full:

Plead with your mother, plead,
For she is not my wife,
That she put whoredoms from her face,
And her symbols from her breasts.
Lest I strip her naked,
And show her as the day she was born,
And make her like a desert,
And set her like a parched land,
And let her die of thirst.
Upon her sons I have no pity,
Because they are sons of adultery.
For their mother played the harlot,
She that bore them is shameless.
She said, I follow my lovers,
That gave me bread and water,
Wool and flax, oil and drink.
Therefore I strew her path with thorns,
And fence her in with a wall,
That she no longer find her way.
When she pursues her lovers,

[8] The one who added 2 1–3 clearly understood that *ammi* meant *my people*. So for that matter did other prophets, e. g., Zech. 8 8.

And does not overtake them,
When she seeks, but does not find,
Then she will say, I return to my first love,
For better was it then than now.
She did not even know
That I was the one who gave her
The corn and the wine and the oil.
But of the abundance of my silver,
And of the gold, they made a god.
So I withhold my corn in its time,
And my new wine in its season;
I recover my wool and my flax,
With which she would clothe her flesh.
Now will I expose her lewdness to her lovers,
And none shall save her from my hand.
I will put a stop to her gladness,
Her feast and new moon and sabbath,
I will destroy her vine and fig tree,
Of which she said, they're my fee,
Which my lovers gave me.
I will make them a thicket,
Where wild beasts will feed.
Will visit on her the days of the Baals,
To whom she burned incense,
And adorned her with rings and jewels.
For thus she went after her lovers,
And forgot me her God.[9]

The passage makes as perfect a unit as we can expect to find, and quite after Hosea's practice in the form of an address to Israel by Jahveh himself. Using a figure common enough in later prophecy, and quite intelligible from Hosea's other oracles, the adulterous wife is pictured as the figurative mother of Israel, while her children are the people themselves. It is obvious that the adultery here as in Cc. 4—14 is a figure for idolatry and no-

[9] The last line is difficult. Marti makes it the introduction of the prophecy following. It seems better to take the last words נאם־יהוה as the heading of that oracle. That leaves the last line very short, perhaps intentionally, but there may have been a confusing of the end of one and the beginning of another section, and I have ventured a guess, in restoration.

thing else, and that alone is the ground for the severe arraignment. It is clear here too that in spite of hints at other lost chances, the doom of Israel is final. None shall rescue the guilty one from the avenging hand; for Jahveh here is not a God of love, but of vengeance. Israel is unpitied, and has no longer any claim for God's protection. The passage has nothing to do with Gomer, for Gomer was not the mother of Israel as Rachel was.

In all respects the conception is exactly what we have found in Hosea's prophecies in Cc. 4—14, and the authenticity of the passage is beyond question.

When we turn to the witness who will offer us the other group, we shall hear quite another story. Two of the passages need not detain us long. For their late origin is generally recognized, and they offer no contribution either to Hosea's message or life. The first section 2 1—3 (Eng. 1 10—2 1) is a beautiful messianic prophecy painting in rosy colors an impressive picture of the restored unity and prosperity of the whole nation as in the days of David, and is usually assigned to a late post-exilic age. The second section 2 16—25 (Eng. 2 14—23) is from the hand of a gifted poet, who was familiar with the material in the other group (1 2—9; 2 4—15) and contributes a supplement. He gives expression to a beautiful faith that one day Jahveh would renew the broken bond with Israel in a union that would last forever. Both sections therefore show affiliation with the redemptive passages already noted as additions in Cc. 4—14, and reveal ideas not only beyond any existing conditions in Hosea's time, but also beyond the visions even of a reasonable faith. It was in later days when Israel's faith rose to the point that it seemed as if Jahveh must rescue his then loyal people, for their distress was so acute that it appeared that he could not fail to hear their cry.

Now we are ready to call our last witness, and his evidence, contained in C. 3, has been more misunderstood, so it seems to me, than almost any other chapter in the Bible. Yet, I shall have utterly failed to be thus far convincing, or the mere recital of the words will give a pretty conclusive hint as to the proper interpretation. Our witness speaks:

And Jahveh spoke to me again: go love a woman dear to an intimate[10] and an adulteress, as Jahveh loves the Israelites in spite of their turning to other gods and cherishing raisin cakes. And I bought her for me for fifteen pieces of silver, and a homer and a lethek of barley. And I said to her, many days thou shalt tarry for me, not practising fornication, nor allying thyself with a man. And I am so towards thee.[11] For many days shall the Israelites tarry without king or prince or sacrifice or pillar or ephod and teraphim. Afterwards will the Israelites again seek Jahveh their God and David their king; and they shall hasten to Jahveh and to his goodness in the latter days.

It will be noted in the first place that the passage is in form autobiographical, and therefore seemingly of the highest authority. But I may remind you that Professor Torrey has explained the use of the first person in what are deemed the memoirs of Ezra as a literary device of the ingenious Chronicler to make his story plausible. It would not be consistent to accept as an explanation in one case a theory which I was unable to admit in another, so I will say frankly that I have no idea why the author of this piece employed the first person. Perhaps it does not require any particular explanation, for the prophets do often use the first person and the author of this piece was a prophet; and a prophet with a beautiful message.

The vital question is something quite different. The real point is that usually in this case the literary form has determined the interpretation. It is an autobiographical sketch, and is in the book of Hosea, and therefore Hosea is here telling his own story. Whatever problems of text or exegesis arise must be solved on the basis of that fundamental hypothesis. Now form-criticism has attained

[10] This phrase is obscure in meaning. Hölscher is confident that the verb is active, so that the meaning would be "loving a neighbor," or as LXX "a lover of wickedness." But, as Nowack says, that fits ill with the term "adulteress." For my purpose it does not matter what the phrase means. It is clear from the whole passage that here a bad woman is described.

[11] Nowack emends to read, "and I will not come into thee." The phrase looks like a gloss, for it comes in awkwardly, and mars the exposition, for naturally there need be no pledge of Jahveh's fidelity to Israel, and the prophet certainly does not mean that Jahveh will have nothing to do with Israel.

quite a prominent place as a new element in dealing with the New Testament, and the principle may be of value in the Old Testament as well. But we must be on our guard about over-simplification of the problems in the one testament or the other.

In the passage under consideration a vital question is this: what is the writer's aim in telling the tale? Is it to depict personal history or to give a comforting message to suffering Israel? The answer is so positive, that a clear understanding of the passage lies right at hand.

The passage is a parable, but a parable of a peculiar kind. In normal parabolic teaching an invented story is told, the aim of which is to make the real purpose so clear that he who runs may read. But the parabler does not always get his meaning over. So Nathan must explain to David the application of his story, and the disciples must needs ask for an explanation of one of the simplest of Jesus' parables. Now our author was not speaking his story with a chance subsequently to explain, but writing, and the key must be a part of his prophecy if he is to get it across. In this case the exposition is really necessary, for if the very simple story stood alone it would be quite unintelligible. What could one get out of a story that a man is directed to love an adulteress, that he buys one, and bids her live many days an isolated life of chastity? For both procedures were quite alien to Hebrew experience or usage.

The author runs no risk of misunderstanding. He intersperses his parable with the interpretation so that the real meaning stands out clear as a bell. Indeed he seems to be almost impatient of the story, so that it is sometimes obscured while he rushes on to make the real message stand out.

These considerations alone would persuade me that Hosea had no hand in the composition of the passage; that it has nothing whatever to do with his life or message, that it was one of those innumerable scraps produced in the late days of Israel which the compilers of the prophetic books incorporated according to their convictions of suitability, not always critically sound; and that

the compiler inserted the passage in Hosea, quite in the wrong place, because its contents were sexual in character.

It is necessary to scrutinize the passage somewhat more closely, and not content ourselves with sweeping generalizations. In the first place the discipline of the erring woman is an invention to explain the exile. As God's discipline of Israel the matter is intelligible, but no man actually disciplined his wife in that way. As often noticed the "many days" have a widely different sense in the two cases. The real point is that after an indefinite period God will take back his erring people.

Again, there is nothing whatever in this passage or elsewhere to make it clear that the adulterous wife is to be identified with Gomer-bath-Diblaim, and unless that identification is established beyond reasonable doubt the case against Hosea's maligned wife falls to the ground. There is nothing to go on but inference, and no one would dare go into a court to-day with a grave charge against a woman with an identification based wholly on inference. In this case inference points quite the other way. If the writer meant Gomer, he should have made it plainer than calling her an adulterous woman, for as we have seen there is not elsewhere a scrap of valid evidence which reflects any evil in Hosea's wife. If this woman were Gomer, she would not have to be bought. David bought Michal from Saul for one hundred Philistine foreskins, but he did not buy her back again from Paltiel who had taken her to wife after David's flight. Further, there is no hint in the passage itself, though it is usually read in, that the woman is other than a new *dramatis persona*. There is no suggestion that she was an already well known woman.

For that matter what reason is there to hold that the man of this tale is Hosea? It may seem sufficient that the passage is in Hosea's book. That evidence would be sufficient, if it were clear that the passage came from Hosea's times, but it loses all weight if the passage belongs to a much later era. Hosea's story in the first chapter, the authenticity of which is beyond reasonable doubt, is told in the third person, and were this Hosean it would presumably be in the same form. There is no intimation in this

passage that the man of the story had ever been married before, except the debated word "again." Authorities are divided as to whether the proper rendering is "again" or "still," and whether it qualifies "spoke" or "love." The evidence is too uncertain to help much in forming an opinion. The theory that Hosea had divorced Gomer and was buying her back has to meet the stubborn fact that in Israel the punishment for adultery in a wife was neither divorce nor isolation, but death, in the early days by burning and in the later days by stoning. As a matter of fact I can find no evidence that Hosea ever thought of divorcing his wife. All that we know of his married life is the record of the birth of his children in C. 1. Hosea himself brought no charge against his wife; that was the work of other hands.

If now we view the passage for a moment as a whole, we are forced to conclude that even if the hands are Esau's, and there is much doubt about this, the voice is Jacob's. The message of this passage is not that of Hosea. Here God loves Israel in spite of past sins, and after a period of probation, Israel would return joyfully to their own God and to their lawful king, the latter phrase betraying the Judean origin of the passage. Furthermore there is an interesting theological conception which is certainly not Hosean. There is a conception which reminds us of the doctrine of purgatory. Israel is to exist for an indefinite period without the usual conveniences of earth or the joyful blessings of heaven.

Harper indeed saw that the contents of the passage made the interpretation as an experience of the prophet's life difficult, and so he resorted to the easy expedient of eliminating v. 5 as a gloss. But v. 5 is the snapper to the whip; it is the climax of the story, and is perfectly consistent with all that has gone before.

The witnesses in the case have all been heard. An attempt has been made to weigh scrupulously their credibility. This being a presidential address, there is no jury to render a strange verdict, and the auditors may not now even offer a criticism. The court is all powerful, and finds a verdict easy: the charge against Gomer is dismissed. Next case.

THE STROPHE IN HEBREW POETRY AND PSALM 29

KEMPER FULLERTON
OBERLIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

I

THERE is a somewhat violent reaction taking place at present against the attempt to discover stanzas or strophes in Hebrew poetry. Any one who indulges in such a diversion renders himself liable to the charge of dilettantism. There is little doubt that the endeavor to establish strophical regularity in Hebrew poetry has often been carried too far and led to wooden results. Professor Torrey's warnings on this subject in his new commentary on Second Isaiah[1] are timely. They are needed to restore the balance. And yet, has not Professor Torrey himself possibly gone a little too far in the opposite direction? The fact urged by him,[2] though not undisputed, that strophes or stanzas seem to be wanting in other Semitic literature does, at first sight, create a strong presumption against their existence in Hebrew poetry. Yet, after paying his respects in no uncertain terms to those who have preceded him in the study of Hebrew poetical structure, Professor Torrey ends his discussion of the subject with the admission that there are, nevertheless, "*occasional* strophic forms, especially in the Psalter."[3] But if there are even occasional in-

[1] *The Second Isaiah*, 1928, Part. I, Chap. X.

[2] P. 175.

[3] P. 179. Italics Professor Torrey's. A little earlier (p. 176) he says: "It is in only a *few* cases—*noteworthy exceptions*—that strophes are to be seen; quatrain following quatrain in unbroken succession, or other divi-

stances of strophical arrangement in Hebrew poetry, the initial presumption against their existence, drawn from the fact that such arrangements do not occur in other Semitic literatures, at once breaks down. At most it can be urged only against the *frequency* of the strophical arrangement in Hebrew. But the question is now open: Are there few or many examples of regular strophes? Professor Torrey says there are but few; Professor Duhm, to take an extreme advocate of the opposite view, says there are many. Duhm would reduce most of the poems in Second Isaiah to a quatrain arrangement. Torrey disputes this. He remarks: "It may be, indeed, that traces of strophic arrangement will eventually be pointed out in some poem or poems of the Second Isaiah; there is no impossibility in the supposition.[4] I can only say for my part, that I have thus far been unable to discover anything of the sort."[5] Yet he says of Chap. 53 that it is a poem "in which the greater part of the material does in fact *happen* to fall into divisions of four lines each."[6] The word 'happen' would suggest that the arrangement of the 'divisions' was purely accidental. That this is Torrey's view seems to be clear from the following remarkable passage on the very next page which I am venturing to annotate:

> "It is easy to see that in Hebrew poetry the minor logical divisions of the subject-matter must very frequently occupy just four lines, that is, two metric verses.[7] The Hebrew sent-

sions corresponding to one another in number of lines, or in other points of structure. The conclusion should be obvious, that a stanza of given length was not one of the recognized features of Hebrew poetry *in general*." (Italics mine).

[4] Here again the presumption drawn from Semitic literature in general is, at least theoretically, broken down.

[5] P. 182, the conclusion of his discussion of the subject.

[6] P. 177. Italics mine. Note also the word 'divisions' rather than stanzas or strophes.

[7] The phrase, "logical divisions of the subject-matter," can naturally refer only to the thought-sequence of a poem. This, it is said, "very frequently" (n. b.) falls into quatrains and "must" do so. Why 'must?' The next sentence informs us.

ence, like the Semitic sentence in general, is normally short, and simply constructed. Because of the principle of parallelism, with its repetition, *one* double line is ordinarily not enough for the expression of an idea. We should be left with the impression of abruptness, of a thing half constructed and left unfinished. The quatrain is naturally suited to embody the short sentences which are so numerous; and is likely to be employed *again and again*, quite *involuntarily*[8] (italics mine). There is this amount of truth, but no more, in the postulate of *Vierzeiler* poems which plays such an important part in the modern German treatment of Hebrew verse. The period consisting of two double lines is by far the most common logical division of any Hebrew poem. It becomes a vicious unity only when it is insisted upon."[9]

[8] In this paragraph we are informed why it is that the thought divisions very frequently fall into quatrains. The reason is an aesthetic one, found in the genius of the Hebrew language for the short sentence, and in the principle of Hebrew poetry, namely parallelism. The double line alone would leave us aesthetically unsatisfied. The abruptness and unfinished character of the thought-formulation would not be pleasing. The quatrain is employed 'again and again' to relieve this. But why 'involuntarily'? This word reminds us of Torrey's contention that the most of the thought-material in Is. 53 just *happens* to fall into quatrains. Why should an arrangement which admittedly has a very definite aesthetic value and which occurs so frequently in Hebrew be accidental ('happen'), quite 'involuntary'? Why should the aesthetically pleasing quality of a poetic structure such as the quatrain not be intended by the poet?

[9] Here, again, the frequency of the quatrain is admitted. But there is a significant recurrence, at the end of the paragraph, of the phrase, "*logical* division," with which it began. Why not *poetical* division, or stanza or strophe? Is it because Professor Torrey has a subconscious feeling that if he uses the word stanza, he will run the risk of having his contention challenged that the quatrain is not an intended poetical figure but only an involuntary, though natural, thought division? If stanza or strophe is used, this would imply that the Hebrew poets were quite conscious of the *poetical* significance of the quatrain. But this is an inference which Professor Torrey seems reluctant to admit. And the reason for this reluctance is clear. If the Hebrew poets realized the poetical possibilities of the quatrain, we would expect them to make extensive rather than only occasional use of it.

In the above paragraph the frequency and aesthetic significance of the quatrain in Hebrew poetry are admitted. The theory that it was an involuntary 'logical division' rather than an intentional poetical figure does not, for the reasons given in the annotations, seem to me to be at all probable.

But the question remains, how far the stanza is regular in any given poem. It is quite conceivable that the quatrain, if a natural poetical division, is considerably more dominant than Torrey would have us believe and less dominant than Duhm imagines. It is undoubtedly true that the impression of regularity in Hebrew poetry which modern commentaries often suggest is only "achieved," to use Torrey's expression, by drastic textual criticism, and Professor Torrey insists that "there is a difference between occasional surgery and habitual butchery." But unfortunately, at this point taste enters in, and *de gustibus non est disputandum.* Surgery at times is almost as bloody business as butchery. The difference between them lies mainly in the results. The results which appeal to us we are likely to ascribe to surgery, and the results we do not like we impute to butchery. Undoubtedly there has been much butchery practised upon the ailing Hebrew text, but on the other hand the text is ill, at times very ill, as I believe, and the attempt to restore to symmetry a twisted and distorted text appeals to me as surgery rather than butchery. It all depends upon how it is done, with reverence for the sanctity of the body operated upon and with skill, or with indifference to the marvelous character of this textual corpus and with crude means. Granted the frequency of the quatrain (and Torrey does grant it); granted its aesthetic and not simply logical significance (and Torrey would seem compelled to grant that also); and granted that such significance was appreciated and intended by the Hebrew poets themselves (a probability which Torrey seems to be disinclined to admit but which I think it is very difficult to avoid conceding); it follows that the stanza or strophe is a more appropriate word for these poetical figures than logical or thought divisions. This is not a mere strife about words. Torrey uses 'logical division' instead of stanza because he has

something in mind essentially different from the stanza and its function.

But if these quatrains are once recognized as stanzas, the question may fairly be raised whether Hebrew poets may not be thought of as experimenting with this poetical figure. Is it not probable that at times they may have thought that a regular arrangement in quatrains would achieve a desirable literary effect? Professor Torrey himself seems to feel the theoretical probability of such a thing when he says: "The Semitic feeling for number and symmetry is a well-recognized characteristic of the race, and we might well expect that in such liturgical compositions as make up the Hebrew Psalter would be found, if anywhere, poetry in strophic forms."[10] This theoretical probability is much strengthened by another consideration which at the same time tends to offset the presumption against the existence of strophical regularity in Hebrew poetry drawn from its absence from other Semitic literature. I think it may be taken as a generally admitted fact that the poetry of the Hebrews as a whole is far and away superior to the poetry of either Egypt or Babylon.[11] The refining quality of a higher ethical religion naturally expressed itself in more beautiful poetic forms. Furthermore, the very fact that the Hebrews did not seem able to express themselves adequately in other forms of art—painting, sculpture, architecture—resulted in a concentration of their energies upon the one form of art in which they did find a vent for their great genius, that is, upon writing. They became the creators of one of the world's greatest literatures. In view of this, is it unreasonable to suppose that they may have developed the aesthetic quality of symmetry beyond their contemporaries? I grant at once that my argument has been a speculative one. All that I have intended to accomplish by means of it is to show that, on the basis of Professor Torrey's own formulation of the problem, it would be a very natural thing for the Hebrew poets to take advantage of the

[10] P. 176.

[11] The magnificent hymn of Akhnaton is, perhaps, the one outstanding hymn that may challenge comparison with the best in Hebrew poetry.

genius of their language and the fundamental principle of their poetry to express their ideas at times in a regular strophical arrangement. Whether they actually did do so or not becomes thus simply a question of fact, to be determined by patient investigation. A renewed study of the subject in the light of Professor Torrey's rather drastic criticism of current methods can alone decide. All I plead for is that his criticism of the attempts of other scholars to find symmetrical arrangements in Hebrew poetry should not check such experiments too hastily. Their legitimacy is certainly not to be called in question by Torrey's parody of them in which he seeks to reduce Tennyson's "Crossing the Bar" to rhythmical regularity, clever though that parody is. Caricature is an easy way of disposing of any experimental work, but it has its limitations. It may show at times the folly of a method when misapplied, but this does not necessarily disprove the soundness of the method itself. I cannot claim that my experiments in Hebrew poetry (I fully admit their experimental nature) have had as wide a range as Professor Torrey's. I must therefore be prepared to admit the charge of insufficient induction. All I can testify to is that these experiments were originally undertaken in an exegetical rather than a literary interest, and that again and again I have been surprised to find how, when an exegetical difficulty is cleared up in Hebrew poetry, a rhythmical difficulty is at the same time solved, and a regular stanza arrangement seems often to emerge through which the meaning and beauty of a poem become more evident. I realize the danger, however, to which all students of ancient texts are exposed, to discover things that are not there—Glozel finds! The modern ear is in many respects attuned to a different scale of values from that to which the ancient ear was keyed. It is difficult for us to catch the overtones of beauty which charmed the ear of the early poet, and we may be tempted to substitute for them the overtones which delight our own ears. On the other hand, to affirm that the quatrain arrangement into which much of Is. 53 admittedly falls just 'happened' seems to be going far beyond the probabilities of the case, especially in view of the fact that this

poem is the finest in a "suite of twenty-seven lyrics" which Torrey pronounces to be "the greatest single poetical work of any age."[12] I doubt very much whether in such great poetry anything just happens. The careless rapture of the poet is not to be identified with haphazard composition. If the quatrain arrangement is as frequent as Torrey admits, and if it is grounded in the structure of the Hebrew language and the ultimate principle of Hebrew poetry (parallelism), why is there anything improbable in the supposition that Hebrew poets, especially the greatest of them all, consciously experimented with the quatrain and used it to produce varying aesthetic effects? And this leads me to a final question.

Was the Hebrew poet tied only to the quatrain as a means of developed poetic expression? Professor Torrey remarks in his discussion of Hebrew rhythms, as distinguished from stanzas, that "we are not here dealing with the easy-going productions of unlettered men."[13] In that case it would be the most natural thing in the world for these Hebrew poets, beginning with the quatrain, to go on to experiment with other forms of the stanza. Torrey admits that the tristich is such another form, though he again denies its frequency or regularity.[14] I have ventured to call attention in this JOURNAL[15] to the very clearly marked ten-line division in Ps. 104. I cannot admit that this arrangement is simply an illusion of my own imagination. It has an objective verification in the very remarkable and beautiful relationship of this Psalm to Gen. 1, which becomes obvious when once the ten-line division is recognized, and in the exegetical difficulties which are cleared up by means of it. It is perhaps rather unfair

[12] P. X. This is a rather sweeping statement, though anyone who has sought to plumb the depths of the fifty-third chapter would be disposed to pardon it. Yet for sheer intellectual and poetical power I would be strongly inclined to rank the author of Job above the author of Second Isaiah. But, again, such judgments are matters of taste, not of dogma.

[13] P. 166.

[14] Pp. 158, 178. It is interesting to remember that the earliest of the Vedas are composed in three- and four-line stanzas.

[15] Vol. XL (1921), Part. II, pp. 43ff.

to the exquisite little lyric, Ps. 29, to introduce it at the end of this discussion as another example of the feeling for symmetrical form among Hebrew poets. To do so will almost necessarily be taken as a challenge and thus will be provocative of criticism, whereas the approach to the enjoyment of such a poetical gem should be in the spirit of sympathy rather than of debate. But I am emboldened to use this Psalm as a possible evidence of my contentions because I know that the poem itself is above criticism even if my arrangement of it is not. All I shall try to do is to point out what seems to me to be a rare beauty in it which scholars have strangely overlooked, but which is disclosed when once the symmetrical structure of the Psalm is more fully understood.

II

(1) There is a general agreement among scholars that the poem begins and ends with a quatrain, the *Pax in terris* of the last four lines corresponding to the *Gloria in excelsis* of the first four,[16] as Delitzsch long ago pointed out. Or is it only the modern ear that catches the music of this beautiful antiphonal?

(2) Again, the Psalm brims over with little artificialities that involve, from the Hebrew point of view, real beauties of expression, though they cannot always be effectively imitated in English.

(a) Thus, the step-like progression in the wording of the thoughts, each line adding its own small increment to the thought till it becomes completely formulated, has always been recognized:

> Give unto Jahweh, ye sons of God,
> Give unto Jahweh glory and strength,
> Give unto Jahweh the glory due unto his name (vv. 1, 2a).

[16] So, amongst recent scholars, Duhm, Staerk, Kittel. Gunkel's arrangement which separates v. 11 as a liturgical addition from what precedes obscures in a most unfortunate way the beauty of the correspondence between the introduction and conclusion of the poem. Bertholet in Kautzsch[4] attempts no strophical arrangement. For the arrangement which I venture to suggest, see the end of this article.

The voice of Jahweh over the waters,
Jahweh over the mighty waters (v. 3a, c.).

The voice of Jahweh is shattering the cedars,
Jahweh hath shattered the cedars of Lebanon (v. 5).

The voice of Jahweh maketh the wilderness to writhe,
Jahweh maketh to writhe the Wilderness of Kadesh (v. 8).

Is it, by the way, only an odd coincidence that the introductory lines of the great hymn to the Assyrian god of storm and thunder, Ramman, is arranged in the same way?

"Ramman the glorious" is thy name, exalted god;
"Lord Ramman, mighty bull and glorious" is thy name, exalted god;
"Ramman, Child of Heaven, mighty bull and glorious" is thy name, exalted god.[17]

(b) Again, the figure of chiasm, so frequent in Hebrew poetry, is dearly loved by the author of Ps. 29. At v. 6a the object of the verb stands at the end of the line, at v. 6b at the beginning.

Jahweh hath made to skip as a calf *Lebanon*,
Sirion as a young wild ox.[18]

At vv. 5, 8, and 10 the subject precedes the verb in line a and follows it in line b in the Hebrew, while in v. 11 the object precedes the verb in line a, but follows it in line b:

Jahweh *strength* to his people doth give,
Jahweh blesseth his people with *peace*.

(c) There is also a constant interplay between the Voice of Jahweh and Jahweh as subject of the verbs.

The Voice of Jahweh over the waters,
Jahweh over the mighty waters (v. 3).

The Voice of Jahweh is shattering the cedars,
Jahweh hath shattered the cedars of Lebanon (v. 5).

The Voice of Jahweh maketh the wilderness to writhe,
Jahweh maketh to writhe the wilderness of Kadesh (v. 8).

[17] Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, pp. 147ff.

[18] The suffix is to be struck out in וירקידם as its presence injures both the parallelism and the rhythm of the couplet. So, scholars generally.

(d) Another very striking artifice of the Psalm is the fact that there are just seven "voices of Jahweh" or peals of thunder. In view of these illustrations, it is clear that if there is any psalm in the Psalter which is *studied*, it is Psalm 29. These various phenomena did not just happen; they are obviously intended. But the marvellous thing about this poem is that in spite of its seeming artificiality it conveys in the Hebrew the feeling of spontaneity. I spoke of it above as *brimming* with artificialities advisedly. "Brimming" suggests the idea of spontaneity, exuberance. What we would term the artificialities in the composition do not cramp its spirit. In other words, we have in Psalm 29 an example of the highest art, in which the poet is perfect master of his medium of expression, and the rhetorical forms which the Hebrew language loves come to him without effort. The impression of woodenness which would be conveyed in a literal imitation in English of the peculiarities of the Hebrew is not at all the impression which the original suggests, and when Ps. 29 is said to be 'studied,' what is meant is that the author has expressed in it a highly developed feeling for form.

(3) Now it is this delicate sensitiveness to form in the Psalm which must be borne in mind when we come to examine its text and possible strophical arrangement.

In the first place it suggests that at two places the text should be corrected. (a) The alternation of the voice of Jahweh with Jahweh as subject of the verbs in the illustrations above under 2—c at once suggests that Jahweh has fallen out at v. 9b. When it is restored, this rhythmically defective line is at the same time corrected:

> The Voice of Jahweh tosseth the oaks,
> Jahweh hath stripped the forests bare.[19]

[19] So Duhm, after Bickell. יהוה, abbreviated to ', has no doubt fallen out before the following '. Staerk, Bertholet and Gunkel ignore this simple and obvious correction of the text. Briggs's, Buhl's, and Kittel's substitution of the Voice of Jahweh instead of Jahweh alone ignores the interplay of Voice of Jahweh with Jahweh and results in eight peals of thunder instead of the evidently intended seven.

(b) Again, as v. 3 now stands it reads:

> The Voice of Jahweh is over the waters,
> The God of Glory thundered,
> Jahweh over the mighty waters.

But a comparison with the phenomena under 2—a above at once suggests that v. 3b is introduced at the wrong place. We should read:

> 3a The Voice of Jahweh is over the waters,
> 3c Jahweh over the mighty waters;
> 4a The Voice of Jahweh with power,
> 4b The Voice of Jahweh with majesty.

This leaves v. 3b hanging in the air. Where does it belong? Before answering this question let us turn to what Professor Torrey would call the 'logical thought-divisions' of the Psalm.

(4) In addition to the opening and closing quatrains (vv. 1, 2 and vv. 10, 11) there are three clearly marked thought-divisions in the body of the Psalm (vv. 3—9). (a) In vv. 3, 4 there is a description of what seems to be the gathering of the storm out at sea.[20] Now, if v. 3b is for the moment omitted, we have just four lines descriptive of the beginning of the storm, which remind us of the initial and concluding quatrains. (b) In vv. 5 and 6 the storm breaks upon the land, shattering the tall cedars of Lebanon and rocking the massive Hermon to its base. In the naive description of the poet, Lebanon and Sirion (Hermon) dance about, move as restlessly as the helpless creatures that may be thought of as cowering in the caverns at their base. Here, again, there are, very clearly, four lines. Then comes a line without any parallel (v. 7) describing the lightning-flash.

> The Voice of Jahweh is hewing out flames of fire.

[20] I think the view that the waters here refer to the Mediterranean, from which direction the storms usually come, is the most probable view of v. 3. But if they refer to the waters above the sky (cf. Gen. 1 6–8) my argument is not affected at all. In any case vv. 3 and 4 describe the gathering of the storm.

The metaphor is a bold one but effective.[21] (c) Finally, in vv. 8–9b the storm is described as sweeping out into the desert. Here, again, there is a quatrain if v. 9b is emended as proposed above, but with an extra line outside the parallelism (v. 9c).[22]

[21] The Thunder-God among the Mayas of Central America is called "lightning, the cutter." See *Dic. of Religion and Ethics*, III, 207b.

[22] Whether v. 9a and b describe the effects of the storm upon wild animals in the desert, or upon the trees, or upon both animals and trees is difficult to determine, but fortunately immaterial to my argument. (1) The usual translation—The Voice of Jahweh maketh the hinds to calve, Jahweh strippeth the forests (cf. Baethgen, Staerk, Kittel, König)—follows the ancient versions which see the double reference to animals and trees. Against this view may be urged: (a) The polel of חול elsewhere is intransitive, to writhe in travail pains, not transitive, to bring on travail pains. (b) The feminine plural יערות for forests is found only here; elsewhere the plural is masculine. (c) The lack of parallelism is unexpected in this carefully wrought-out Psalm. Hence the attempt has been made to restore synonymous parallelism. (2) V. a has been emended to agree with v. b.: The Voice of Jahweh hath tossed the oaks, Jahweh hath stripped the forests (Briggs, Duhm, Bertholet). In one of the great Vedic hymns to the storm god, Indra, we meet the line: "Far distant on the forest falls the tempest in a circling way." (Griffith, *Hymns of the Rigveda*, Book I, 29, Vol. I, p. 49). (a) But this translation requires taking יחולל transitively, but in the sense of יחיל in v. 8. Yet this sense might be inferred from the intransitive use of the hithpolel at Jer. 23 19. (b) It also retains the anomalous form, יערות. (c) The plural of oaks (terebinths) is regularly אילים. (d) Gunkel also urges that the trees have already been referred to (v. 5) and we are now in the region of the desert. (3) V. b is made by Gunkel to agree with v. a.: The Voice of Jahweh maketh the hinds to calve, Jahweh hath frightened the wild goats. (a) This view requires, again, the transitive meaning of יחולל; (b) the emendation of יַחֲשֹׂף to יַחְפֹּשׂ; (c) the assignment to the latter form of the doubtful meaning, 'to frighten;' and (d) the emendation of יערות to יעלות. (So also Buhl in *B. H.*). In favor of this is the fact that twice the wild goats are brought into parallelism with the hinds (Job 31 1; Prov. 5 19), and also that the progress of the poem is perhaps bettered, the thought passing from the deserts to the animals which inhabit them. On the other hand, nowhere else in the Old Testament does the thought of premature parturition among animals caused by fear occur. Yet I Sam. 4 19 is analogous, and the thought is found in Pliny *Nat. Hist.* VIII, 47 (72), where thunder is said to produce miscarriage among sheep unless these timid creatures are kept together in flocks. (Cf. Gunkel). The problems of the couplet are still unsolved.

It is this extra line which has again given difficulty to commentators. Now here is a clearly marked division of the subject-matter which falls without any forcing whatever into three quatrains, describing, respectively, the gathering of the storm at sea (vv. 3, 4), its breaking upon the mountains (vv. 5, 6), and its sweeping on, inland, to the desert (vv. 8 and 9a, b). The question at once arises: In a psalm which is so evidently studied in its arrangement are these quatrains simply accidental or due only to the logic of the thought without regard to their poetical significance? But, it may be urged, how about the three lines which do not fit into the quatrain scheme, v. 3b, v. 7, and v. 9c? Do not these three lines disturb, most unfortunately, the quatrain arrangement and negative any attempt to discover symmetry in the Psalm? It is at this point that scholars seem to me to have been led sadly astray. One group, represented by Briggs, Duhm, and Gunkel, have attempted by means of various emendations to bring the entire poem into a symmetrical quatrain arrangement but, from my point of view, in a most undesirable and unconvincing way.[23] Another group of scholars represented by

[23] Briggs follows the very simple expedient of rejecting all the three offending lines as glosses. But the grounds assigned for this procedure are trivial. Duhm retains v. 3b in its present position but reduces v. 4 to one line by striking out Jahweh twice. He thus secures his quatrain for vv. 3 and 4. Vv. 5 and 6 give another quatrain. He then emends the recalcitrant v. 7 into two lines and joins them with v. 8, thus securing another quatrain. The three lines of v. 9 are then made into the required four lines by the conjecture that a line has fallen out before v. 9b, which Duhm duly restores. Gunkel, on the other hand, rejects v. 3b, as Briggs does, as a gloss. So he, too, attains the quatrain arrangement in vv. 3–4 and 5–6. The redundant v. 7 is then got rid of by taking its first three words (The Voice of Jahweh is hewing) as a variant to the first three words of v. 5 (the Voice of Jahweh is shattering), while the last two words (flames of fire) are transferred to fill out the admittedly defective v. 9b. Vv. 8 and 9a, b are taken as another quatrain. V. 9c with a conjectured line before it (Gunkel does not actually attempt to suggest its wording as Duhm does), is then taken with v. 10 as the next quatrain. This leaves v. 11 hanging in the air, and it is accordingly regarded as a liturgical addition. Such painful efforts would, indeed, seem to justify Professor Torrey's satire. Yet they are not to be condemned as

Baethgen, Kittel, Staerk, Bertholet, and König either make no attempt at a strophical arrangement or hold that the stanzas are of irregular lengths. But I believe there is a more excellent way which finds a real strophical regularity in the Psalm, in keeping with its studied character and its clearly marked thought divisions, and at the same time reveals an added beauty in the composition which has hitherto been overlooked.

(a) If the three troublesome lines, vv. 3b, 7 and 9c, are looked at in relation to each other, a very interesting connection at once becomes obvious. V. 3b refers to the thunder, v. 7 to the lightning, and v. 9c to the heavenly chanting. (b) Again, v. 9c has the form of a circumstantial clause and may best be rendered "*while* in his palace (temple) all are saying glory."[24] But this line cannot naturally be taken with v. 10. It would have no connection with it either in thought or structure.[25] No; v. 9c must go with what precedes. (c) This suggests that v. 7 should also be taken with what precedes instead of with what follows.[26] (d) But we have seen that v. 3b, when examined in the light of the peculiar construction of the Psalm, is out of place, and the question was raised whether it could be restored to its rightful position. If it is transferred to the end of v. 4, that is, to the end of the quatrain, then the three quatrains in which the thunderstorm is described would each close with an extra line, making a five-line stanza in each case. (e) Let us now set these three extra lines together:

> The God of Glory hath thundered,
> The Voice of Jahweh is hewing out flames of fire,
> While in his temple all are saying glory.

experiments but only as unfortunate experiments. We have noticed enough regularity in the poem to suggest that symmetry in its construction was intended; there is, therefore, a sound reason for these attempts to secure it, however mistaken the specific expedients of these scholars may be.

[24] So Baethgen and Duhm. The translation 'and' (so Bertholet, Staerk, König, Gunkel) or 'yet' (*doch*, Kittel) is certainly not the natural translation of the initial waw of v. 9c.

[25] Gunkel feels this and hence suggests that a line has fallen out before it with which it would combine into a couplet.

[26] Against Duhm, Staerk and Kittel.

It will be seen at once that these three extra lines *carry the main thought and reveal the crowning beauty of our Psalm,* the contrast between the heavenly chant up above the clouds, in the serene blue of the sky, Jahweh's dwelling place, and the roar of the storm upon the earth, a kind of deep pedal accompaniment to the celestial antiphonal. Undisturbed by the dissonances upon earth, which only serve to reveal by contrast the heavenly harmony more fully, the stately chant of the sons of God goes on.[27] No wonder the poet can draw the reassuring conclusion that, in spite of this fierce thunderstorm, God reigneth and will give peace to his people. He was king when a greater storm than this broke over the world, the Noachic Deluge.[28] His purposes of good will not be overthrown.[29] If this result, accomplished by the transposition of but one line (v. 3b), is accepted, and the fact of a five-line stanza, composed of a quatrain and an extra closing line, is recognized, the intentional character of the arrangement can scarcely be doubted. These three extra lines describing the thunder, the lightning, and the singing are no accident. Nor are they glosses or corrupted lines. In them and their relationships the art of the psalm reaches its climax.[30] But such a poem

[27] This contrast has often been pointed out, but the relationship to it of the three extra lines (vv. 3b, 7, 9c) in their combination has not been observed.

[28] The word for flood in the Hebrew regularly refers to the Deluge.

[29] One of the hymns to Indra closes with the same note:

> "Indra is King of all that moves and moves not,
> Of creatures tamed and horned, the thunder-wielder,
> Over all living men he rules as sovran, containing
> All as spokes within the felly."
>
> (Griffith, *Op. Cit.*, Bk. I, 33; Vol. I, 59).

[30] The relationship of the lines suggested above meets the objections urged by Briggs and Duhm against v. 9c as it now stands. "This line," says Briggs, "comes in here without any propriety. It has no manner of connection with the twelve previous lines making three tetrastichs and none with the tetrastich that follows. Doubtless the thought is an appropriate one, if it were expressed in the style and method of the author of the Psalm." Then, after referring to the contrast developed above between the heavenly music and the terrestrial noise of the storm, he concludes:

could hardly stand alone. Are there no other examples of such high art in Hebrew poetical literature? If there were not, then I should have to admit that my arrangement must be due simply to an illusion, purely subjective fancy. But if it is an illusion, it is at least to me a very pleasant one, and I do not believe Professor Torrey will have the heart to rob me of it, even though he may have his private convictions as to the validity of my methods and results.

Prelude.

Gloria in Excelsis.

v. 1. a. Give unto the Lord, ye Sons of God,[a]
b. Give unto the Lord glory and strength,
v. 2. a. Give unto the Lord the glory due his name,
b. Worship the Lord in the beautiful (garments) of holiness.[b]

The Storm.

I.

The Gathering of the Storm.

v. 3. a. The Voice of the Lord is over the waters,
c. The Lord is over the swelling[c] waters,
v. 4. a. The Voice of the Lord is with power,
b. The Voice of the Lord is with majesty;
v. 3. b. The God of glory hath thundered.

"The difficulty is that this idea is not clearly brought out, and the single line, tacked on here, is too indefinite to give such a grand conception." Duhm's criticism is briefer: "The circumstantial clause, v. 9c, cannot follow immediately on the couplet (v. 9a, b) if the absurd idea is to be avoided that the supernal beings break out into the Gloria just because of the stripping of the trees." Whether these criticisms are justified or not, in view of the exposition offered above, may be left to the reader to decide.

(a) Elohim beings, angelic creatures inhabiting the supernal world.

(b) The scene is a temple scene in which the angelic worshippers appear in their beautiful priestly vestments. Cf. Ps. 96 5–9.

(c) Lit. 'many' or 'mighty'.

II.

The Breaking of the Storm.

v. 5. a. The Voice of the Lord is shattering cedars,
b. The Lord hath shattered the cedars of Lebanon,
v. 6. a. He hath made Lebanon quiver[d] like a calf,
b. And Sirion like a young wild ox;
v. 7. The Voice of the Lord is hewing out flames of fire.

III.

The Dying-away of the Storm in the Desert.

v. 8. a. The Voice of the Lord maketh the wilderness to writhe,
b. The Lord maketh to writhe the Wilderness of Kadesh,
v. 9. a. The Voice of the Lord tosseth the oaks,
b. The Lord hath stripped the forests bare;
c. While in his temple all are chanting "Glory."

Postlude.

Pax in Terris.

v. 10. a. The Lord sat throned at the Flood,
b. The Lord hath sat throned as king for ever,
v. 11. a. The Lord giveth strength to his people,
b. The Lord blesseth his people with peace.[e]

([d]) Lit. 'make to skip' or 'dance.' In the Pi'el it is generally connected with a happy mood. But the Kal at Ps. 114 4, 6 refers to the jumping about of terrified animals, and this is unquestionably the meaning in the present passage.

([e]) Probably the imperfects are neither jussives nor futures, but imperfects of general truth. The attempt to find specific eschatological implications in this Psalm seems to me quite beside the mark. In an old cistern of the fifth century, west of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, there is a baptismal inscription which cites the first line of v. 3: The Voice of the Lord is upon the waters. This cistern may have been connected with the Baptistery mentioned by the Bordeaux Pilgrim as back of the Basilica of Constantine: *Balneum a tergo ubi infantes lavantur.* (See P. Thomsen, *Die Lateinischen und Griechischen Inschriften der Stadt Jerusalem*, p. 28, and Dalman, *Palästina-Jahrb.* III, 1907, p. 37). There is scarcely more excuse for the eschatological interpretation of the Psalm than there is for its application to Baptism, even though the idea of Jahweh as king may be one of the roots of Jewish eschatology.

THE PROBLEM OF DEUTERONOMY

ADAM C. WELCH
NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH

DR Bewer courteously forwarded to me a copy of his article in the Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. XLVII, pp. 305—21, in which he gave his reasons for rejecting my position on the date of Deuteronomy. With even greater courtesy he met my request for an opportunity to reply and went so far as to secure the interest of the editor in one who is little known to American scholars. It is pleasant to recognise that we have only one interest in this matter, to arrive at the truth on a question which is of moment to all who care about the Old Testament.

It is not, however, easy to reply to a detailed criticism on a wide subject, and I confess to strong sympathy with an editor who hesitates to admit a lengthy paper which enters, point by point, into matters raised in a previous article. None, except specialists on the topic under discussion, will trouble to hunt up the previous article and to weigh against each other the conflicting arguments. The ordinary student is apt to glance over the reply with a certain impatience, because he has not immediately at hand the material to which it refers.

The generosity of the editor in having anything to do with me seems to dictate that one should ignore many of Bewer's detailed objections, though they seem capable of satisfactory answers. I propose to select one significant and central feature in the matter at issue and to confine attention principally to this with only such additional material as may naturally arise out of it.

In this way even a reply may gain a certain unity and may thus be made readable by those who are not prepared to refer back to the original article. Now the leading question, without a clear answer to which everything is left undetermined, is the exact meaning of the terms in which Deuteronomy describes the Yahweh sanctuary.

There are then, as is well-known, three expressions employed in the book to describe the place to which the Israelite may legitimately bring his sacrifices. These are: the sanctuary which Yahweh your God chooses out of all your tribes, which occurs once at 12: 5; the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses בְּאַחַד שְׁבָטֶיךָ, which also occurs only once 12 : 14, and the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses, which occurs at intervals throughout the book.

As to the first of these, there is no debate between Bewer and myself over its sense. It means the temple at Jerusalem. For the expression is not confined to Deuteronomy; it appears also in the books of Kings and Chronicles. And there it appears in very significant connections which make clear what is involved in it. Thus it is employed so soon as Solomon founded the temple 1 Kings 8: 16: and when a prophet delivers over the Northern tribes to Jeroboam, he reserves one tribe to Rehoboam for the sake of Jerusalem the city which I chose out of all the tribes of Israel 1 Kings 11: 32. That is to say, the temple owes its peculiar sanctity to the divine will, and Judah owes its continuance to the fact that it contains the temple. Nothing less than the divine will is behind temple and kingdom, for it will be noted that neither Solomon who built the temple nor Rehoboam whose kingdom was preserved for its sake, was active in repressing worship at the high places. In building the temple, Solomon was serving a higher will than his own ends.

As for the third expression, 'the sanctuary which Yahweh shall or may choose,' it is tolerant of a double interpretation. It may mean the definite sanctuary which can boast of being the object of the divine election, and which can only be one. The phrase will then be merely the abbreviated form of the formula which appears in full at 12, 5, and must mean the Jerusalem

temple. But, according to the usage of the book of Deuteronomy, the words need not have this limited sense. It is only this side of the question, viz. the usage in Deuteronomy of a noun with the article followed by a qualifying clause introduced by a relative, with which I have any ambition to deal. Oestreicher, on the other hand, claimed that in Hebrew usage a noun with the article is tolerant at any time of a distributive sense. The fact that my book appeared very soon after his pamphlet has led several to conclude that we hold the same attitude on this matter. Had I seen his pamphlet before writing the book, I should have been able to make my own position clear. König in his article in the Z. A. W., 1926, pp. 172—5 confidently denied Oestreicher's claim, and took it for granted that in refuting Oestreicher he also disposed of me. It is needless to follow them into this somewhat vague discussion, though I may be allowed to express my opinion that, in his reply to König, Oestreicher had not the worse of the argument. Since, however, I hold no opinion on this general question, it is enough for my purpose to be able to prove that the Code of Deuteronomy uses a noun with the article and a following relative clause in a sense which does not imply one and only one.[1]

It is altogether more profitable to confine attention to the usage of the book of Deuteronomy. Now in 14, 21 there is a law which forbids the Israelites to eat טְרֵפָה; but it is added that thou mayest give it לַגֵּר, to the stranger who is within thy gates, or sell it לְנָכְרִי, to a foreigner. Here the one noun is left wholly indefinite, while the other which is defined by a relative clause is provided with the article. Yet both nouns are clearly used in the same indefinite sense of any stranger or any foreigner. Will Bewer, on the analogy of his interpretation of the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses, insist that the stranger who is within thy gates can only be one? Then he will be driven to the conclusion that

[1] Hence I must mildly demur to Bewer bracketing Oestreicher and myself together in his note on p. 309 as though, since we hold the same position, we were equally annihilated by König. I have never intervened in this discussion, partly because it does not touch my attitude, partly because it does not seem to be soluble on one side or another of the question.

in old Israel each Israelite was only permitted to have a single such within his gates. Yet we have no right to decide that these men were so distributed over the country that no township could contain more than one. A noun with the article and a following relative clause is tolerant of a distributive sense.

Again, chap. 20 contains a series of laws on methods of conducting war. Among these is a regulation forbidding the people to cut down fruit trees in the territory adjoining any town against which they are carrying on war. Verse 20 describes this town as הָעִיר, the town which is waging war with thee, and, in thus describing it, uses a noun with the article and a following relative clause. But, when the same place appears in v. 10 without any qualifying clause, 'when thou approachest a town to fight against it,' it has no article. Now, if the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses can only mean one definite sanctuary, the town which is waging war with Israel can only mean one definite town. And the prescription against cutting down fruit trees must be supposed to be confined to a specific town, such as the capital of Edom or Moab, as the prescription against sacrifice must be confined to Jerusalem. If, on the other hand, the town which wages war with thee may be any town, the sanctuary Yahweh chooses may be any sanctuary. The proof in this particular case is even stronger than in connection with the method of dealing with טְרֵפָה. It might be possible to find a reason for making a difference between the stranger and the foreigner. But here it is the same noun which appears in both cases. Standing alone, it is indefinite; standing with an article and a relative clause it is equally indefinite. The descriptive clause merely marks that the town is hostile, as the descriptive clause added to the sanctuary marks that it can claim to have been elected by the God of Israel. The expression does not mean any sanctuary, but any Yahweh sanctuary.

Further, in chap. 18, 1—8 appear certain regulations which are concerned with the Levites. The opening 5 verses deal with the general revenues and specific priestly income of these men, and close with the remark that Yahweh chose them out of all the tribes of Israel. Verse 5 then continues with the command

that הַלֵּוִי, a levite who may come from any of thy gates to a Yahweh sanctuary shall share in all the privileges of his brethren there. Obviously the article is used there to single out men, not one individual, of the type described, either such as belong to the tribe which Yahweh has chosen, or, more probably, such as desire to be associated with the sanctuary worship. The privilege must not be held to apply to levites who show no such desire. In fact the article practically answers to 'such a levite,' and takes the place of a relative clause which would otherwise have been needed to describe the men. And here again the sense is distributive.

In view of these examples of the use of a noun with the article and a following relative clause inside the Code of Deuteronomy, it seems impossible to deny that 'the sanctuary which Yahweh shall choose' *may* mean any sanctuary which can claim this special character. Only let it be noted that the usage does not prove that the description of the sanctuary must bear this sense. All that can be claimed is that, according to the proved usage of the Code of Deuteronomy, the expression is tolerant of this meaning. What must then determine its specific sense must be an inquiry into the peculiar aims of the Code, and, in particular, into whether it lays stress on the uniqueness or on the character of the place of sacrifice.

But what about the second description, the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses בְּאַחַד שְׁבָטֶיךָ? The phrase, as has been said, only occurs once in Deuteronomy. It must be added that it occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament, a fact which is not without significance in connection with the question at issue. Since it has been pointed out that the first part of the expression is tolerant of a distributive sense, it remains only to ask whether the addition of the final two words serves to limit it, and, in particular, whether it succeeds in stamping the whole with the note of centralisation.

Löhr, thinking that the words do imply such a limitation and unwilling to accept the implication, has proposed to delete the whole sentence as an addition to the original. Unless some better

reason can be offered for throwing suspicion on the words, that appears too easy a way of getting rid of a difficult sentence. It is possible to prove anything, if one may cut out what does not agree with one's favourite theory. Besides, so far as I am aware, Löhr has not clearly dealt with the first description of the sanctuary, as chosen by Yahweh out of all your tribes. Neither he nor Oestreicher has satisfactorily faced the question presented by v. 5; nor have they recognised the presence of the description and its clear meaning in the books of Kings and Chronicles. If they believe as I do for reasons given in my book and in the article in Z. A. W., that verses 1—7 are an addition in the interest of centralisation and take v. 14 to be another addition in the same interest, and if they recognise that the earlier verses say what they have to say without any possibility of misunderstanding, they have to explain why the same man or another who was working in the same interest departed from his clear phrase within the short space of nine verses. And above all they have to explain why he went out of his way to coin a unique expression, and one which was ambiguous.

For the words 'in one of thy tribes' are ambiguous, since they do not involve the limitation which Löhr and Bewer have read into them. Here again the question is concerned with the usage of the Code of Deuteronomy, and with that alone. And its use of אחת or אחד followed by a plural noun is uniformly the same. Fortunately we have no fewer than six other examples: בְּאַחַת עָרֶיךָ, in or about any of thy towns 13, 13, בְּאַחַד שְׁעָרֶיךָ, in any of thy gates 17, 2, מֵאַחַד שְׁעָרֶיךָ from any of thy gates 18, 6, אֶל־אַחַת הֶעָרִים הָאֵלֶּה to any of these towns 19, 5, 11, בְּאַחַד שְׁעָרֶיךָ, in any of thy gates 23, 17. In every case a reference to the context will show that the words have a distributive sense, and are selected in order to express such a distributive. There is no case where they mean 'a particular one of.'

Both Oestreicher and I pointed out the striking resemblance between the law which speaks about the runaway slave 23, 16f., and this regulation dealing with the sanctuary. Probably what influenced him, certainly what influenced me in selecting that

illustration was that here also we have to do with an act of choice. The runaway slave may settle בְּאַחַד שְׁעָרֶיךָ, in any of thy gates which he may select for the purpose. Clearly the law cannot mean that the man was confined in his choice to one particular township. He was left at liberty to select in Israel the place where he meant to settle. In the same way Yahweh was not confined in His choice of a sanctuary to one particular tribe. But we have been told by König in an article in Z. A. W. and by Sellin in the second edition of his Einleitung that the plea is not valid. The slave, it is granted, was free to choose any place he pleased for his future residence, but, after he had chosen, he must live there and nowhere else. In the same way Yahweh was free to choose a sanctuary in one of the tribes, but, after He had chosen it, it alone was the place of legitimate sacrifice. The place had gained a unique position through the act of Yahweh's choice.

But this reads into the law of 23, 16f. more than its terms admit. For it implies that the slave, when once he has settled in a township, may never again move from it. Yet the law has not this question in view and does not deal with it at all. What it does is to give liberty of choice to the man in connection with the place where he elects to settle. It does not say that this becomes his permanent home, or that, should he find better service somewhere else, he may not afterwards change his mind. Besides, König's position is open to much more serious objection. It certainly remained true that, after the slave had settled in one particular place, this remained, so long as he lived in it, his only place of abode. He could not live anywhere else, for the simple reason that he was a man and could not live in two places at once. From this it is just to conclude that, when Yahweh had once chosen a sanctuary in any of the tribes, this remained His choice and became a place of legitimate sacrifice. But to draw the further conclusion that, when Yahweh had once chosen a sanctuary, this became through His selection the only place of legitimate sacrifice is not legitimate. It is simply to beg the whole question which is at issue since it means that Yahweh could not be worshipped by sacrifice in two places at once. All scholars

are agreed that there was a period when Yahweh was worshipped with sacrifice at many shrines, at all of which He had made His name to dwell or had manifested Himself to the worshippers. He had selected them. It is also equally clear that there came a time when sacrifice was only permitted at the temple. The question at issue is to which of these periods in the national life and worship this particular law in Deuteronomy belongs. And to determine that it must belong to the period of centralisation on the ground that Yahweh could not choose two places in which He might record His name any more than a runaway slave could live in two places at once is nothing more or less than a somewhat crass *petitio principii.*

Bewer does not dwell on this effort of König and Sellin, perhaps because he has recognised its dubious validity. Instead he urges on p. 309: 'the natural rendering is the one that has always been given to it "the place which Yahweh shall choose in one of thy tribes." How else could this thought be expressed in Hebrew, unless one were to circumscribe it? If the author wanted to say just this in the most direct way without circumlocution he would have to write thus if everybody were to understand his meaning at once?'

But is the natural rendering of באחד שבטיך in one, a particular one, of thy tribes, whether this has always been given to it or not? It is necessary to insist on a reason which will justify this strong statement. The only method by which we can arrive at the sense of any passage in an ancient document is to interpret it in the light of the language of its own time. Here is a phrase used in one section of the Code of Deuteronomy. The same phrase occurs in six other passages of the same law-book, and in all these cases it is used in a distributive sense 'in any of thy towns or thy gates.' It is incumbent on those who interpret 12, 14 in a limited sense to prove that those words could be used in such a sense or to show that there is some special reason, other than the fact of its suiting their theory, why the words in one case should be given a sense which they bear nowhere else in the Code. And that is what they have hitherto failed to do.

But, further, if Bewer believes that vv. 1—7 are by the same

author as v. 14 and that vv. 5 and 14 were both written to insist on centralisation, he also has to explain why the writer departed from the description he had just given of the sanctuary. There he had expressed his meaning in unmistakable terms of which 'the natural rendering is the one which has always been given to it.' He had also employed phraseology which was used in the historical books to describe the temple at Jerusalem. Yet, he suddenly and unaccountably departs from this and substitutes for the clear phrase 'out of all your tribes,' a couple of words which, in all the rest of the Code to which he prefaces them, are employed in the sense which he does not wish to express.

Again Bewer states on p. 310: 'if the writer wanted to express in Hebrew "any place... in any of thy tribes" he would write בְּכֹל מָקוֹם, as in Ex. 20, 24 and בְּכֹל שְׁבָטֶיךָ for else he would be misunderstood'. This seems doubly erroneous. For the author of Ex. 20, 24 did not write בכל מקום, but בכל הַמָּקוֹם. It may be legitimate to emend those words, but it is not legitimate to build further inferences on an emended text, and especially on an emended text which has no support from the versions. Personally I have become convinced that the text can be defended as it stands, but to deal with that would be to wander into a side-issue. And further, when Bewer thinks that the writer laid himself open to misunderstanding by his use of באחד שבטיך, he is again taking it for granted that the natural rendering of these words is the one which he has given to them. In reality he was using the language of the Code itself, and employing the words in the sense they have throughout it. Had he written בכל שבטיך, he would have laid himself open to greater misunderstanding. For no one who wished to express a distributive sense would have employed language so definite as 'in all thy tribes.' The meaning of that could only be that Yahweh had a sanctuary in each, not in any, of the tribes.

Yet it must be recognised that the determination of the sense of these two words does not decide whether the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses must be only one or may be many. All it can do is to repel the objection brought to the distributive sense from

this particular passage. Even if we read 'in any of thy tribes', the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses there may still be only one. It may be in any tribe, but may yet remain the only legitimate sanctuary. The usage of the ἅπαξ λεγομενον in Deut. 12, 14 falls in line with the other equally vague description, 'the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses'. And all that can be claimed is that the language is tolerant of the existence of several sanctuaries. Bewer thinks the terms used compel us to the conclusion that the writer believed in centralisation. I only claim to have proved that his language admits of either construction. For the final determination of the question we must look elsewhere. We must look at the general attitude of the Code in connection with the cult and seek to determine with which interpretation of the description of the sanctuary that attitude is on closest agreement. And here there are three lines of approach which serve to throw light on the matter.

The first is that the book of Deuteronomy does not consider any other altar than the central one in the temple to be *ipso facto* illegitimate. Thus it has long been recognised that, when the law of 16, 21 forbids the people to plant an asherah beside the altar of Yahweh which thou shalt make thee, it was contemplating a similar liberty in the matter of building altars to that which prevailed under the Book of the Covenant. Hence Driver e. g. in his Comm. *ad. loc.* suggested that this was an excerpt from an older law. But it has been admitted into the Code by the man who is said to have carefully revised that Code in order to adapt it to the principle of centralisation. We are told that he retouched each regulation there, recasting its terms in order to make them conform with the new attitude about the sanctuary. No one can study a modern commentary on the book without admiration for the extraordinary ingenuity with which the lawgivers are supposed to have impressed this character on every institution in the national life. Yet they left untouched, they even admitted, this older regulation which implied that a local altar was not illegitimate.

Again, in 27, 1—8 it is said that Moses not merely permitted, but commanded the people, as soon as they had crossed Jordan,

to build an altar on one of the mountains near Samaria. This altar they were to be careful to build of unhewn stones so as to satisfy the demand of their earlier law, and at this altar which met the requirements of Yahweh they were to offer their burnt offerings and their peace offerings. A later hand has worked over the passage and introduced a demand that some torah be inscribed on great stones. But he has not obscured the original meaning of the account. Indeed, since he left the essential features of the original it is obvious that he had no desire to obscure its meaning.

Now what these two passages imply is that, if not the whole, at least certain parts of the book date from a period at which it was still legitimate for the Israelites to worship at several shrines. And these parts were allowed to remain by men who were revising the whole in the interests of a principle which made every local shrine illegitimate. The more successfully the advocates of this theory prove this revision to have been carried out into the smaller details of the legislation, the more violently does this contradiction of centralisation stare at them. But what the two passages further imply is that at this earlier period, and in regulations which ante-date the movement for centralisation, the people were being enjoined to keep their cult pure and especially to avoid any infection from the cult of their Canaanite neighbours. The law of 16, 21 forbids the association of heathen emblems with the altar of Yahweh. And chap. 27, 1—6 orders that the Israelite altar must be distinct in its very form, and prescribes that the sacrifices offered to Yahweh shall be offered at such an untainted altar. Both laws are definitely directed against the impure cults of Canaan. From early times the Israelite lawgivers were convinced, not only of the distinctive character of their worship, but of the need for strong action to preserve this character in Palestine. The effort after *Kultusreinheit* ante-dates the effort after *Kultuseinheit.*

The second line of approach to decide our question is to seek to determine the main purpose of the Code of Deuteronomy. This was the main thesis of my book on the Code, to prove that the aim of the entire body of law, so far as it deals with the cult, and

even in some matters which were not directly connected with the cult, was to insist on Yahwism versus Baalism, not on central sanctuary versus many sanctuaries. It aims at *Kultusreinheit* not at *Kultuseinheit.* And here Gressmann, though he could not accept the conclusions drawn from it, acknowledged in a review in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* the truth of the main thesis of the book. 'Als die Hauptabsicht des Deuteronomiums betrachtet Welch den Kampf gegen den Baal. Das ist richtig und trifft in der Tat den Nagel auf den Kopf.' But this acknowledgment brings two other conclusions with it.

On the one side, this main contention of the Code is in complete agreement with the two passages in the book which ignore centralisation. For these also contain a polemic against Baalism and show this to have been early. There does not therefore seem to be any necessary reason why we should separate these parts of the book and say that other laws which also seek to maintain purity of worship must come from a time when the movement for centralisation had begun. They may all be successive stages of the same movement directed towards purity of worship. The onus rests on those who hold the opposite to prove that there is some element in the main body of the legislation which compels us to put them down to the later date. And this onus rests upon them the more, because so many of my reviewers have acknowledged that my book succeeds in proving many of the Deuteronomic laws early. Now they cannot find the needed proof of the late character of the main legislation in the mere description of the sanctuary as the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses. For that description has been proved to be tolerant of a wider interpretation. It may mean a sanctuary marked by the specific character that Yahweh has chosen it, as the town of 20, 20 is one which wages war with Israel, or as the stranger to whom one may give טְרֵפָה is distinguished as living in one's township. To recognise that the main aim of the Code is to keep Israel away from all heathen worship in loyalty to its ancestral cult is to gain strong support for the view that this was the sense in which the writer used the language he used about the sanctuary.

On the other side, this recognition of the main purpose of the Code compels us to re-examine all its regulations and see whether their text agrees best with the view that the law-givers were dealing with a people who still worshipped at several sanctuaries which needed to be kept clear of heathen taint, or whether they were instituting a new regulation about centralisation which had the same purpose. Now the effort to construe the Code as demanding a single sanctuary has compelled scholars to take liberties with its text in a way which, I do not hesitate to say, would not be tolerated in the scientific treatment of any other ancient document. If, on the other hand, the law-givers were legislating for a people who worshipped at several sanctuaries, the text becomes capable of a straightforward explanation.[2]

But, further, their theory has driven scholars to regard many of these laws as laying down what can only be called impracticable and intolerable demands. Here I venture to break the condition I laid on myself at the beginning of this article, and enter on one matter of detail. It is well-known that Deuteronomy, in connection with the annual festivals chap. 16, dates passover and mazzoth in the month of Abib, but leaves the date of the feast of weeks and that of tabernacles rather vague. All it determines about these two is that they shall be celebrated in connection with the harvest. It, further, commands that all males shall take part in these annual festivals. And it also requires that the entire household, slaves as well as children, shall join in the celebration of tabernacles. Now, on the supposition that this legislation was intended for a community which worshipped at a local sanctuary, as Elkanah did at Shiloh, the regulations are sane and practicable. There was no need to determine the exact date for the festivals. Each district appointed the date according to its local conditions, as each parish in Scotland determines its harvest thanksgiving. It was practicable to require that all males should attend these festivals, as Presbyterians expect their communicants to celebrate Holy Communion four times in the

[2] For the proof of this I must refer to my book.

year. It was sane to ask the whole household to be present at Sukkoth, because then the harvest was made safe for the year and the household was at liberty. There is no need to import centralisation into that legislation.

Indeed, centralisation made all this series of regulations impracticable. It was impossible to require men to come to the temple while the date of the festivals was left undetermined. Men must know the exact date of the celebration, since they now came from a considerable distance. Accordingly each feast is exactly dated. It was impossible to require that all males shall attend three times in the year. Apart from the question whether men from Galilee could fulfil this requirement, all who lived in diaspora were unable. Accordingly we find a list of festivals in Lev. 23. Bewer would call this part of Ezra's priestly code. I prefer to see in it the legislation of the men who reconstituted the worship at Jerusalem during the century which elapsed between Cyrus' rescript and Nehemiah's building of the wall. It gives a long list of the Israelite מוֹעֲדִים and includes among them the three חַגִּים. It dates these last exactly, prescribes the sacrifices in connection with them and carefully regulates how long they are to last. But it quietly drops all mention of the demand that every male Israelite must attend them. The men were living at Jerusalem. Some of them were returned exiles. They know that such a regulation is impossible.

The two series of regulations belong to two different stages of the Israelite cult and to two different conditions of the national life. They show clearly the changes which centralisation of worship inevitably brought in one specific feature of the people's worship. But to thrust centralisation on Deuteronomy is not merely to do violence to the plain sense of its terms. It is also to lose an invaluable means for tracing the real development of Hebrew religion.

The third line of approach for the decision of this question is the presence of the little section, 12, 1—7, which contains the description of the sanctuary as the one which Yahweh shall choose out of all your tribes. In an article in Z. A. W. 1925,

pp. 250—5 I pointed out that the expression occurs also in the books of Kings and Chronicles, but that it is original in Kings and has been copied by the Chronicler from that source. Further, it has been introduced into Kings by the same editor who judged the successive rulers of Jerusalem by whether they supported or discouraged the worship on the high-places, i. e. by whether they helped forward the movement for centralisation. It marks his sense that the temple was the sole legitimate sanctuary in the country and that it owed this character to nothing less than the divine will. It dates, accordingly, from the time when the effort after centralisation was being made, i. e. the time of the Josianic reformation.

The same phrase occurs once and only once in Deuteronomy. And it appears there in a paragraph, which introduces all the succeeding legislation, but which can readily be separated from all that follows. The paragraph also shows signs of belonging to the later period which believed in the divine extermination of the Canaanite population. The natural inference is that the verses were added by the same editor who introduced this description of the sanctuary into the book of Kings and that they were added at the same time and to serve the same purpose of enforcing centralisation.

Now Bewer may not find all these conclusions valid. But he can scarcely fail to acknowledge that the description of the sanctuary, in view of the places where it occurs in the book of Kings, admirably summed up the law about centralisation. Someone also employed it at the beginning of the Code of Deuteronomy. Bewer will agree that we may see here the hand of the editor who was adapting the legislation to the new principle of centralisation. He further holds that the same hand is to be recognised in the rest of the book. The editor, therefore, departed from his original phrase and employed another. And this other description, as I have pointed out above, was, according to the usage of the Code itself, at least tolerant of an interpretation which this editor detested. That is a conclusion which it is extraordinarily difficult to accept.

What separates Bewer and myself is not the question whether the Code of Deuteronomy was adapted and employed for the purpose of centralisation. We both agree that this great change in Israel's methods of worship was made about the period of Josiah, though we probably differ as to the time when the first tentative efforts were made in this direction. We also agree that the Code bears the marks of an editor. But I limit his work to the insertion of 12, 1—7 and seek to prove that this passage bears in other respects the evidence of the date at which it was inserted. All the rest, with minor exceptions, is older legislation which has been left untouched. He believes that the alteration was interwoven into the entire body of the earlier legislation which was thus recast to adapt it to its new purpose. His main reason for this position is that 'the sanctuary which Yahweh chooses' *must* mean only one sanctuary. Throughout his article he is biassed by the position he has set down at the beginning that König has conclusively proved that the sanctuary Yahweh shall choose can only mean one particular sanctuary. The chief purpose of this reply has been therefore to show that these words are at least tolerant of a wider sense. The words mean, not any sanctuary, but any Yahweh sanctuary; and, as such, they form an admirable summing up of the main aim of the Code, Yahwism versus Baalism.

YAHWEH'S VICTORY OVER THE BABYLONIAN PANTHEON

THE ARCHETYPE OF IS. 21 1—10[1]

JULIAN OBERMANN
JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION

a) *General Characteristics.*

PROPHETIC literature rarely offers a more vivid example of form and rhythm as a constructive means of exegesis and textual criticism than in Is. 21 1—10. As a rule the criteria of metre and parallelism appear of very moderate, mostly negative, value. This, no doubt, is due to the fact that the individual writers often used different metres within one and the same poem, and employed a type of parallelism which by its nature is not easily restorable—as can be seen in almost all cases of so-called *synthetic* parallelism. More frequently, however, it is the peculiar history of the text-transmission that renders the criterion of form valueless. Scribal additions and omissions, marginal glosses and miswritings, above all intentional annotations and interpolations destroy the original form, as they obscure the purpose and the tendency, of a literary unit. In very few cases do we know for certain what the original unit consisted of, where it began and ended, and, accordingly, what its historical background and reli-

[1] The following analysis the writer presented in substance before the meeting of the S. B. L. in December, 1928 (having discussed its text-critical problems before the meeting of 1926).

gious affiliation actually were.[2] To these few cases belongs the poem of Is. 21 1—10. Certainly this is true of its form: it is marked off from its environment at the beginning and the end; it is ruled throughout by a rhythm of two beats; and it employs a *synonymous* parallelism.[3] But just as sharply is our poem marked by its contents: it belongs to the *oracular* type of prophetic literature; specifically, to the prophetic oracles against foreign nations. And, the foreign nation being Babylon,[4] the oracle is closely affiliated with Ps. 137, Dan. 5, and most closely with the prophecies of Is. 13, Is. 14, Jer. 50f., sharing their historical, literary, and cultural background.

Some inferences from these observations I discussed before the meeting of this Society in December 1926. Today I venture to submit what to my conviction presents the archetype of the oracle, or at least the most reasonable approach to it. The title to such a claim naturally stands and falls with its test: the nearer we come to the *shape* of the poem, the better should we be able to appraise the true nature and the intrinsic peculiarities of its *contents*. To mention only the most striking peculiarity: In the first five verses, although the scenes of the poem change most vividly, nothing is said about it, and it is rather left to the reader

[2] Cf. Obermann, "Drei Kontextglossen zum Deboraliede" (in *Livre d'Hommage à la Mémoire du Dr. Samuel Poznánski*), pp. 153f.

[3] Cf. MT in the Kittel edition and the rearranged text at the end of this article. With only the possible (see below n. 38) exception of v. 9b and apart, of course, from the two defective lines in vv. 1a and 2d, the two-beat rhythm is apparent in every line of the oracle, the metre being in 18 lines $= 2 \times 2$ beats, and in 3 lines $= 3 \times 2$ beats; (on v. 5a see below n. 24)—The synonymous parallelism of *expression* is not confined to members right and left of the caesura (vv. 1c, 2b, 2c, 3c, 4a, 5aα, 7b, 7c), but, as is often the case, especially in the later parts of O. T. poetry, it harmonizes entire lines (cf. 3a–b, 3c–4a, 5aα–5aγ, and the very interesting case of v. 8). Parallelism of *ideas* may be found in *every* strophe of the poem.

[4] This is agreed upon both by the medieval Jewish commentators, who naturally ascribe the prophecy to Isaiah, and modern critics (see the literature in the next note). Cobb's theory of the oracle (in this *Journal*, 1898, pp. 40ff.) as prophesying the siege of *Jerusalem* by *Assyria* may be regarded as wholly isolated.

or listener to identify the subject of the individual scenes. But beginning with v. 6, each scene is introduced by a statement specifying the speaking person of the particular scene. Why this difference of procedure? Is it original? And who is the speaking person of the anonymous scenes in vv. 1—5? Is it one and the same person? Or does the speaking person also in these verses change, as it admittedly does in vv. 6—10? In the concluding verse the seer declares that what he has just revealed he has heard from Yahweh of Hosts. To what does this refer, to the whole oracle or to some of its parts? And does it not sound like an unnecessary repetition of "thus has the Lord said to me" in v. 6?

These questions—which have, oddly enough, escaped the attention of modern critics—can only be answered satisfactorily by a reexamining analysis of the oracle as a whole and of the difficulties contained in the individual scenes. Such an analysis is all the more imperative as the oracle appears to have been misunderstood and misinterpreted in almost every detail. Due, apparently, to the Massoretic arrangement just described, it is generally taken for granted that in vv. 1—5 the prophet is speaking in his own name and that it was he who furnished the notes as to the speaking persons in vv. 6—10, so that these notes must be accepted as unquestionably correct.[5] The following analysis proves beyond a doubt that the prophet does not speak throughout vv. 1—5; that the speaking person in these verses changes just as much as in vv. 6—10; that the notes were furnished not by the author of the poem but rather by some editor or glossator; and that of the three notes the first is wrong, the two others only conditionally correct. But perhaps the most interesting result of the present analysis concerns the concluding verse. The current conception takes this verse to be a sort of comforting epilogue addressed to Israel. In reality this verse must be recognized as the climax of the entire

[5] See Duhm (in Nowack's Handkommentar), *Das Buch Jesaia*, pp. 126ff.; Marti (in his Kurzer Handkommentar), *D. B. Jesaja*, pp. 161ff.; Gray (in ICC), *The Book of Is.*, pp. 348ff.; Haller (in the Göttingen Bible II, 3), *Das Judentum*, pp. 16ff., and others (see below n. 10 and n. 30). For the divergent opinion of the Jewish commentaries, see below n. 19 and n. 35.

poem which—and this is the crucial point—is an oracle against Babylon told not to the comfort of Israel but to the praise of Yahweh's victory over the idols of Babel. Accordingly, the speaking persons appear in the following sequence: The Seer; Babylon; the Seer; Babylon; a (mysterious) Voice; Babylon (to a messenger); the Seer (to God); the Seer (to the Babylonian messenger). No wonder, therefore, that the current conception, unaware of this basic fact of the oracle, had to take refuge in an exegesis of a purely speculative character, unable to stand the test of either historical or literary criticism.

b) *The anonymous scenes.*

V. 1. The difficulties begin with the very first words of the oracle. In the Massoretic text the poem is superscribed by the words "Oracle of the wilderness of the sea." The authenticity of this superscription has been universally questioned. "Wilderness of the sea," in itself unintelligible, forms nowhere the object of the oracle. Difficult also is the first line of the oracle proper. Immediately after the superscription, the Hebrew text reads "As storms to sweep through the South," thus making a poem—for which, as has been said, nothing is more characteristic than its rhythm of two beats—begin with a line of three beats. Are we entitled to assume that these two difficulties are responsible for each other, i. e., that the first line of the poem is too short by precisely the same word by which the superscription is too long? If so, the confusion is due to a copyist who, having omitted the word "sea" in the first line, added it subsequently on the margin, so that "sea" came to precede the initial word of the oracle instead of following it.[6] Restoring the misplaced word

[6] More likely the subsequent marginal correction was introduced by a *later* hand; this would account best for the absence of an equivalent of ים altogether in the LXX. Of the explanations attempted by modern critics, those offered by Cobb (ימם) and Marti (המיה or המה), while linguistically unwarranted, come nearest to the above restoration. Ibn Ezra (ed. M. Friedlaender, London, 1877) and D. Qimḥi (*Miqraoth Gedholoth*, Warsaw, 1886) thought to meet the difficulty of MT by taking ים in the sense of "West" (Babylon being מערב כנגד פרס ומדי)—a suggestion evid-

to its original position, we obtain the two beats required by the form, and a figure most suitable to the contents, of the oracle. „Storms of the sea," it is needless to say, is a natural phenomenon frequently employed in O. T. poetry.[7] The visionary prophet announces in the prologue of his oracle that from the desert, from a fearful land, a catastrophe is breaking forth as terrifying "as storms of the sea, sweeping through the Negeb."[8]

V. 2a—b. A difficulty of a different type presents itself in the scene following the prologue:

> A grievous vision
> has been told to me:
> The traitor deals treacherously,
> the violator violates!

Who is speaking? It is generally assumed that it is the prophet, predicting by these words the forthcoming attack of the Persian armies on Babylon. But if this be true, the scene would be out of keeping with the style and the logic established by the oracular literature of the O. T. It would be, in the first place, the only instance that a prophet is *told* a vision, instead of his telling the vision to those concerned.[9] But why is the vision of Babel's destruction, so longed for by Hebrew poets and psalm-

ently inspired by the *Midrash* on our oracle contained in *Cant. Rabba*, ch. III, 4.

7 So apparently also Targum: כמי ימא דנגדן (followed, as often, by doublet: כעלעולין). To quote only cases of similar context, comp. Is. 5 30 כנהמת ים; Jer. 6 23 כים יהמה; and especially Jer. 51 42 עלה על בבל הים (which latter might well be inspired by our line, just as Jer. 50 39 by Is. 14, and *ibid.* v. 42 by Jer. 6 23). Comp. also the frequent (synonymous) juxtaposition of סופה and סערה, and the connection of the latter word with "sea storms" (Is. 23 4; Jonah 1 4; and elsewhere).

8 To a Hebrew, especially Palestinian, poet the word נגב, far from being confined to the vicinity of Qadesh, could be applied to any point of the long coast stretch between Suez and the Persian gulf. Comp. the סערות תימן of Zech. 9 4 (see the preceding note) and the commentaries on our verse.

9 A prophet nowhere in the O. T. is *told* a vision; but he *sees* (Is. 30 10b; Ez. 10 28; 13 8 *ff.*), or is *shown* (Am. 7 1; 8 1; Dan. 8 1; חזון נראה אלי) a vision; it is to others that he *tells* it.

ists, grievous to our seer? How could he call the executor of a divine mission, which he himself predicts, a traitor? Other prophets speak of such executor in most flattering terms even where he is to turn *against* Israel. Here, however, we are to believe that a Hebrew poet condemns the subduer of Israel's arch enemy, inviting him, at the same time, to "come up," to "lay siege."[10] All these difficulties disappear in the light of what proves to be an intrinsic characteristic of our oracle. It is not the prophet that speaks the quoted lines; it is rather Babylon whom he introduces as speaking—a technique frequently used in prophetical literature, most conspicuously perhaps in Is. 14, where the dwellers of Sheol are made to say in their own words how they would greet the dethroned king of Babylon when he arrives in the underworld.[11] It is Babylon that most naturally says "a *grievous* vision has been *told* to me," and it is Babylon alone that would call her forthcoming subduer a "traitor" and "violator."[12]

V. 2c–d. After having visualized what Babel would say in face of her approaching calamity, the prophet resumes to speak in his own name. It is he who in the following scene addresses himself to the predestined subduer of Babel:

Go up, oh Elam!
lay siege, oh Media!

Thus far all is well with this scene. Unfortunately, the following line is corrupted. For the Massoretic reading "all the sigh-

[10] It was mainly in view of this consideration that Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah* I, p. 125, and Driver, *Isaiah: His Life and Times*, p. 96, adopted the theory (previously advanced by Kleinert, *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1877, p. 174ff.) that the oracle concerns the siege of Babylon, not by Persia, but by Assyria. But this theory invites only new difficulties, helping none of those already existing.

[11] Vv. 10b–12 (or perhaps 10b–15; cf. v. 16). See the same technique in Is. 5 4–6; 28 9–10; Jer. 6 24. Comp. Cant. *passim*, and already in the Song of Deborah, Jud. 5 28b and 30.

[12] The difficulty of this scene (when taken to be spoken by the prophet in his own name) was felt also by Rashi, Ibn Ezra and Qimḥi; accordingly they explain קשה as "grievous to Babel," and adopt more or less literally Targum's "rendering" of v. 2b (אניסיא מתאנסין ובזזיא מתבזזין).

ing thereof have I made to cease" gives no sense. Critics seem to have given up all hope as to the problem of this line. Here metre and parallelism offer unerring guidance. They show that, although the consonant text of the obscured line is short one beat, it is otherwise admirably correct. The obscurity is merely due to mistaken reading and vocalization. Dismissing the vowels, no one could fail to see in the last word of the line an imperative feminine, *hashbithî*,[13] in logical accordance with the two preceding imp. fem., *'alî* and *ṣûrî*. The sequence thus is: Go up... Lay siege...Destroy. But the parallelism of the poem requires "destroy" to stand in the same juxtaposition to a synonymous word in which "lay siege" stands to "go up." Such synonym of "destroy" is actually furnished by the Hebrew text, if we only divide the consonants properly, and read not *kol 'anḫathah*, "all her sighing," but rather *kallî naḫtah*, "consume her ease."[14] We thus obtain a line beautifully fitting to the context:

Go up, oh Elam!
lay siege, oh Media!
Consume her ease!
destroy — — —!

The last beat is missing. But it could only have been a word synonymous with "her ease," e. g. *shibhtah*, "her leisure," *biṭḫathah*, "her confidence," or the like.[15] In perfect harmony with

[13] So in fact (but without any further inferences) Gray, p. 153 (following therein evid. Marti, p. 162).

[14] So that כלאנחתה = נחתה כלא. The word כלא thus stands for כַּלִּי, the א indicating merely the presence of *î*; (comp. ורצאתי = ורציתי in Ez. 43 27; נקיא = נקי in Joel 4 19; etc.). Possibly כלא is defective writing for כלאי (just as נחלת = נחלתי, and אמרת = אמרתי in Ps. 16 2, 6). Other examples for א = *î* in Delitzsch, *Die Lese- und Schreibfehler im A. T.*, pp. 36f.; for the absence of *matres lectionis* for final *î*, *ibid.*, p. 28; and for erroneous word division, *ibid.* pp. 2ff., and Perles, *Analekten zur Textkr. des A. T.* (Leipzig 1922), pp. 11ff. See the dictionaries on כלה and כלא.

[15] שבתה (from שבת, or perhaps "her dwelling," from ישב) would account well for the omission of the beat in MT (haplography). Cf. the juxtaposition of נחת and שובה in Is. 30 15, where בשבת ונחת would yield a smoother context; so indeed Graetz (quoted by Marti).

the historical situation, the prophet spurs Persia to put an end to Babylon's ease and self-reliance. The same word, *naḫath*, in the sense of "ease" and paralleled with "confidence" and "peacefulness," is once used by Isaiah when he admonishes Judah to forego her anxiety and restlessness, her scheming of war and plot.[16] Our prophet, on the contrary, invites the end of such state of *naḫath* for Babylonia. If anything can be learned from the Chaldean, Hebrew and Greek documents about the neo-Babylonian empire, it is just that mentality of ease and luxury, of devotion to works of peace and cult, of leisure and self-confidence.[17] This state of *naḫath*, the prophet visualizes, is coming to a sudden stop. And he is about to make, in the next scenes, Babylonia herself give us a glimpse into her *naḫath*, and the circumstances under which it did come to a stop.

Vv. 3–4a. But just here we face the crux of the oracle. In the strophe following the one just discussed, someone, speaking in the first person sing., tells us how he suffers, how filled he is with pain, how a pleasant evening has been turned for him into terror. All critics take it for granted that the prophet is speaking. But it is difficult to conceive how such an awkward assumption could ever have come about. It means making the poet intolerably verbose, if not ridiculous. One cannot help thinking of that famous orderly who, asked one morning how his patient was, answered: "you should know what a night I've had!" *He* has had a night. In the midst of an oracle in which, as we have seen, every word counts, the prophet, we are to believe, pursues, for ten whole lines, no other purpose but to make us feel sorry for him. Babylon is to be destroyed, but the prophet's loins tremble, *his* pangs

[16] While Is. 30 15 thus crystallizes the idea of נחת by placing it in juxtaposition to its synonyms (בטחה, השקט, שובה), this is brilliantly supplemented in Qoh. 4 6 and 9 11 by means of antithesis (עמל, רעות רוח, זעקה). Cf. the development of נחת in Rabbinical Hebrew to the sense of "pleasure," "satisfaction;" see agadic und liturgical usages in Ben Jehuda, *Thesaurus* VII, p. 6319a f.

[17] Comp. Breasted, *Ancient Times*, pp. 164f.; Rogers, *A Hist. of Bab. and Ass.* II, pp. 297ff.; King, *A Hist. of Bab.*, pp. 275ff.; Goodspeed, *A Hist. of the Bab. and Ass.*, pp. 357ff.

are like those of a woman in travail, and for *him* a nice evening has been ruined! Some critics suggest that in these lines the prophet intends to tell us that he was "prophetically mad."[18] But why does he do so just here, interrupting his vision? And what sort of pleasant evening does he, mad though he is, regret having missed? Well, if some one is mad here, it is surely not the prophet.

There can be no doubt whatever that the speaking person here is, again, Babylon.[19] For this, explicit evidence, if any be needed, can be found in those prophecies which, as stated above, are most akin to our oracle, both in literary and historical respects. In Is. 13 a prophet says that the Babylonians, in face of their approaching prostration by Media, "shall be dismayed, seized with pangs and pains, as a travailing woman they shall writhe"—using the same words[20] and the same figures as those employed in the scene before us. Even more specific is the corresponding scene in Jer. 50 43. There too we deal with an oracle against Babel, and there it is expressly stated that it is the king of Babylon whose hands grow feeble in face of the terrible news, anguish seizes him, pangs as of a woman in travail. But the most striking parallel to our scene is the one found in the genuine Jeremiah, in his vision of the enemy "from the North." In precisely the same manner as in the case before us Jeremiah, after having described the sea-like roaring of the forthcoming storm against Judah, suddenly, without a word to indicate the change of sub-

[18] Gray, p. 353; see the lengthy explanation in Duhm, pp. 127f. No less forced Cheyne and Driver who, in all seriousness, attempt to lessen the difficulty by ascribing the oracle to Isaiah; see above n. 10.

[19] So to all appearance already Targum, rendering vv. 3–4 in the 3. person plural! The Midrash (above n. 6) contrives, of course, to make the prophet speak these lines in his own name by applying the method of bold Agada. But Rashi does not hesitate to mark disagreement by stating: ולפי פשוטו הנביא אומר הקינה והאנינות כאלו זו בבל מתאוננת. So also Qimḥi: הנביא מדבר בלשון כל אחד מבני בבל. Even more emphatic Ibn Ezra: כי הכל יודע שהנביא ישמח במפלת בבל ואיך יאמר על כן מלאו.

[20] But unmistakable in view of the 3rd p. pl.; (whence perhaps Targum's rendering of our scene; see the preceding note).

ject, introduces the Judeans as speaking: "We have heard his repute, our hands grow feeble, anguish seizes us, pangs as of a woman in travail."[21] Indeed, in view of the striking similarity in word and rhythm, one might justly assume that ultimately all these oracles are indebted to one and the same literary source[22] —but then they reveal all the more clearly the true purpose of the scene under discussion. As in the quoted instances so here, too, the prophet not only foresees the coming of the storm: he also hears beforehand the voice of Babylon reacting to the storm already at hand:

> Therefore are filled
> my loins with trembling,
> Pangs have seized me
> as of a woman in travail;
> I am bent at what I hear,
> I am dismayed at what I see:
> My heart is confounded,
> shuddering has affrighted me.

Vv. 4b–5. And now we understand the full weight of that mysterious line "The eve of my delight has been turned for me into terror." Babylon is still speaking, describing the exact moment in which her troubles began or, from the stand-point of the prophet, will begin. A feast was being prepared, probably one of those religious festivals to the glory of Marduk, to "the joy of the Igigi and Anunnaki," so frequently referred to in the Babylonian royal annals.[23] Already the tables are arranged, the carpets spread. Already they are eating, drinking, making merry.[24] And suddenly all that banqueting gaiety comes to a stop.

[21] Mark especially שמענו את שמעו in 6 24, and שמע מלך בבל in 50 43; it is the word משמע in our scene (taken by modern critics to indicate the prophet's "audition") that is usually hinted at in support of the current conception.

[22] Or, which is perhaps more likely, they all use (independently) a well established oracular style.

[23] See the Nebuchadnezzar Inscriptions, *passim* (*KB* III, 2, pp. 10ff.); Nabopolassar (*ibid.* p. 7); Nabonidus (*ibid.* p. 101).

[24] In v. 5aγ (regarded by Duhm as a gloss) we have in all probability half of a line which originally contained 2 × 2 beats (see above n. 3); the two

Paralysed by a penetrating voice that cries: "Get up, ye Captains! Oil the shields!

Oddly enough, this or a very similar scene is verified by the descriptions subsequent to the actual event in Daniel, Herodotus and Xenophon.[25] In Dan., it is true, the Babylonian king perceives not a crying *voice* announcing the beginning of the end, but rather a writing *hand*. But in Dan., too, the overthrow of Babylon by Persia begins during a *banquet* at the royal palace. And there, too, the king dies on *that very night*[26] that began with so much gaiety. Yet what in Dan. may be regarded as a dependent literary scheme, could very well, in the description of our oracle and also in that of Herodotus, be based on knowledge of the actual social and religious life in Babylon's capital.[27] "The eve of my delight" could indeed refer to one of the evenings during the New Year's celebration when Marduk determines the

missing beats, paralleling אכול שתה, must have formed much the same context as Is. 22 13a–b; ששון שמחה, indeed, completes the picture most suitably.

[25] See Dan. 5, *passim*. Herodotus (in the Loeb Library) I 191: "all this time they were dancing and making merry at a festival which chanced to be toward." Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* (*ibidem*) VII 5, 15: "a certain festival had come round in Babylon, during which all Babylon was accustomed to drink and revel all night long." Cf. also Jer. 51 39.

[26] Corroborating both the נשף of ouv oracle and the *ὅλην τὴν νύκτα* of Xenophon. That *nesheph* does not necessarily mean "twilight" appears sufficiently clear by the מאחרי בנשף of Is. 5 11.

[27] If not (see Montgomery, in the ICC, *A Crit. and Exeg. Comm. on the Book of Daniel*, p. 72) both Dan. and the Greeks reflect "true historical traditions." It has been pointed out (Marti and others) that an oracle *predicting* events does not need to stand the test of historicity and, in this case, to be borne out by the record of the actual event as evidenced in the Nabonidus-Cyrus Chronicle (*KB* III 2, p. 128ff.; for more recent renderings, see Montgomery, p. 66, n. 12). But it is just as natural that for the *concrete details* of his oracle (vv. 2c, 4b–5, 9c) the prophet would draw upon his direct or indirect knowledge of Babylonia, and that he would emphasize those details by which he, a Hebrew poet and visionary, was particularly impressed. And, incidentally, as far as Dan. and the Greeks corroborate the details of the oracle, they harmonize rather than contradict the Nabonidus-Cyrus chronicle.

destinies of the "coming days." From cuneiform sources we know that the rôle of the king during the New Year festival, both in its cultic and profane parts, was particularly conspicuous.[28]

c) *The superscribed scenes.*

It would seem that our investigation as to the speaking person of the individual scenes of the oracle could stop here. For what up to this point had to be brought out by analysis is from now on furnished by the text itself. Beginning with v. 6, each scene is preceded by a note designed to state who the speaker of what follows is. Yet, if these notes have been furnished by the prophet himself, we must now, in view of the results of the above analysis, wonder all the more why he did not deem it necessary to introduce similar notes up to v. 5. If, however, these notes are the work of a reader or editor—are they correct? That they are *not* an original ingredient of the oracle becomes apparent when we realize that none of them is rhythmically merged with the strophe which it precedes.[29] They are, rather, loosely attached accessories, and were they altogether missing, the shape of the single strophes would remain the same. We must, therefore, try to understand the nature of the scenes in vv. 6–10 without regard to their superscriptions.

[28] Comp. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften u. d. A. T.* (3. ed.), p. 515; Langdon, *The Bab. Epic of Creation*, pp. 21ff.; Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien* II, pp. 95ff. (see especially pp. 98f.). Dan. 5 4, too, presupposes the eve (v. 30) of a religious festival.

[29] It is very fortunate for a just appraisal of the oracle that the form of v. 8 is of such a nature as to leave no doubt that ויקרא אריה presents no organic part of the scene and that these two words stand outside both its metre and its parallelism. Notice אנכי עמד ‖ ועל משמרתי; על־מצפה אדני ‖ כל הלילות ‖ תמיד יומם; אנכי נצב; see the same parallelism of entire lines (rather than, or in addition to, that of "members") in Hos. 9 10 a–b; Am. 3 4; 3 5; 5 2; Is. 2 7; Jer. 6 13; and very often in Deuterois. (cf. the arrangement in Torrey, *The Second Isaiah*, of 40 1–2a; 2b–c; 7–8; and *passim*). If thus ויקרא אריה forms no ingredient of the oracle, then ויען ויאמר of 9b has nothing to refer to, and would have to be eliminated on this ground alone; see, however, below n. 38. For the elimination of v. 6a the strongest evidence is given below in the text.

Vv. 6–7. Who, then, is the speaker of the scene contained in v. 6f? In this scene someone is commanded to go and make a seer post himself and tell what he sees, and give particular attention to his eventual seeing of a company of riders on horses, asses, camels. Is it possible that the superscription of this scene is correct, and that, accordingly, it is God who demands the prophet to go to a seer and make *him* look out for a divine vision? Is it, furthermore, possible that God, while telling what the seer would perceive, still wants him to post himself and, as though he were a Sunday school pupil, to give attention, much attention? If so, then we must give up all hope of understanding what is going on. After having told us of his vision in five preceding scenes, the prophet would suddenly assure us "so said the Lord unto me." Does that mean that in what precedes he invented things without divine inspiration? But apart from all that: since when does a prophet, worthy enough to be spoken to by Yahweh, have to employ the service of another seer in order to obtain an oracle? Modern critics suggest that the seer is the prophet's second self, his psychic ego, which he objectifies as different from himself, and so forth.[30] The same prophet who only a while ago was supposed to be prophetically mad, is now supposed to hold a class in religious psychology, and to discriminate between his sarcic self as "I" and his mental self as "he." All that is sheer exegetical fancy, without a particle of evidence outside the stereotyped superscription of a pious reader.[31]

[30] See the brilliant but, to the passage under discussion, entirely irrelevant defense of the current conception by Duhm (followed by Marti, Gray, Haller). That the situation of the scene as implied by v. 6a is *ohne alle Analogie* and *höchst unnatürlich* has been recognized by Buhl, and supported by Stade (*ZATW*, 1888, pp. 157ff.); but instead of looking at the scene regardless of v. 6a, they propose to change all verbs in the 3rd person of 6b–7 into such in the 2nd person, reading at the same time לְכָה עֲמֹדָה מְצַפֶּה or לְכָה עֲמֹד הַמְצַפֶּה in lieu of the excellent reading of MT! As far as I see, Qimḥi appears to be the only commentator who recognized the true nature of the scene (see below n. 35).

[31] The mere stereotyped character of 6a should have aroused suspicion as to its genuinness in the midst of a poem that otherwise shows no trace

If it were not for that superscription no one would suppose for a moment that the speaker of the scene could be any one but Babylon. So also in Daniel, the king of Babel, after having perceived the uncanny warning of the writing hand, sends to the seers and sorcerers. Here again Dan. 5 may be inspired by our oracle, but this would make it all the more clear that in the scene before us Babylon is speaking. It is Babylon that anxiously wishes that the seer be consulted.[32] Instances of such practice in and outside of Israel are so many that it would be superfluous to quote them.[33] But why seek for evidence from without? Is. 21 itself furnishes all the proof that could be desired. In vv. 11—12 an oracle is contained which scholars agree is written by the same prophet that wrote the oracle of vv. 1—10. There the prophet states distinctly that he received an inquiry "from Seir": "Watchman, what of the night?" We thus deal here with a prophet who —in reality or, more likely, in his vision—was called upon by foreign nations to give oracular instruction.[34] And precisely this situation we face here. Babylon, stirred with terror in the eve of her delight by the warning voice crying "To arms!", sends a messenger to the seer for an oracle, beseeching him to look out for a vision of riders,[35] and to use all his attention, probably to ascertain their kind, force, direction, perhaps also to stop their

of literary imitation or conventionality (v. 3b being, of course, a different case; see n. 22). On the other hand, nothing would be more natural for an editor or reader (who was perplexed by the constant change of the speaking subject in the oracle) than just this stereotyped "for so said the Lord unto me," especially, if he, as is most likely, was acquainted with the writings of the genuine Isaiah (who in 8 11; 18 4; 31 4, uses the phrase—but employing "Yahweh"—in connections so prominent that it was bound to become popular).

[32] Spoken by Babylon, the unusual word מצפה for "seer" is well accounted for, the poet thereby skilfully avoiding the use of expressions customary in *Hebrew*, such as חוזה, רואה, נביא.

[33] See e. g. 1 Sam. 28 (comp. Frazer, *Folk-lore in the O. T.*, pp. 191 ff.); 1 Kings 12 23f.; 14 2f.; 20 14; 2 Kings 3 11; 19 12; 22 13.

[34] Similarly 2 Kings 8 7f.; cf. 2 Kings 5 and 1 2f.

[35] So in substance Qimḥi: ואמר על לשון שרי בבל שיאמרו זה לזה שיעמידו המצפה לראות אם בא חיל מדי ופרס ויגיד אשר יראה.

movements by some magic divination.[36] The poem has reached at this point great dramatic tension. Babylon, the proud and carefree, the powerful oppressor of Israel, sends to a Hebrew seer for oracular help and advice, just as in times of leisure she used to ask Hebrew singers to entertain her with songs of Zion. But the climax is yet to come. It is the admirable art of our poem that its climax coincides with the very last beat of its lapidary lines.

Vv. 8–10. The seer is already stationed on his watch-post. The Babylonian envoy hears him call to the "Lord"—not to "Yahweh," naturally then (so the envoy must feel), to Marduk—that he had been on his guard-stand continuously for days and nights. Does that mean that the seer, just as Hab. 2, had stationed himself on his own initiative, days and nights ere the Bab. inquiry has reached him? Or did he post himself only following the inquiry, and—like Jer. 42—had he to wait days and nights before his calling to the Lord for a vision was granted? The poem leaves this question unanswered. But it does state that the seer's call, after constant watching by day and uninterrupted vigil all the nights, was granted *in terms of the Babylonian inquiry.* Has Marduk—oh comforting hope—been merciful once more? With the suddenness of divine revelation he perceives the very vision which Babylon so anxiously had asked him to look out for:

> Behold, there, coming:
> a riding troop of men—
> horsemen in pairs![37]

Attention! Babylon had asked the seer, should he perceive what he now actually does perceive, to give attention, much attention. Babylon is, in fear and misgiving, waiting for the redeeming word. Her fate depends on it. The tension is of over-

[36] See Jastrow, *Aspects of Religious Belief* etc., pp. 240ff.; Meissner, II, pp. 242ff. and *passim.*

[37] The change of metre (not of rhythm; see above n. 3) in the three lines of this scene presents an ingenious means of distinguishing these lines as being spoken by the seer to God.

whelming force. Now the prophet speaks. The oracle did come to him—the oracle to which all that precedes in the poem was a gradual prelude:

> Fallen[38] is Babylon
> with all the images of her gods!
> He has smashed to the earth
> my down-treading and my thresher!

And ere the inquirer can ask who it was that wrought this terrifying and, to him, blasphemous oracle; ere he can recover from the shock and the absurdity that the great and proud Babel and her mighty, unconquerable gods are fallen and broken—the uncanny seer adds the sharp words that threaten a logic merciless and irrevocable:

> What I have heard
> from Yahweh of Sebaoth,
> The God of Israel—
> have I told unto you!

At last he has spoken the fatal word: Yahweh![39] Now he has reached the climax. And with it, the last word of his poem. With the brevity of genius he has unfolded before the unsuspecting eyes that had looked up to him for help and advice the whole dramatic grandeur of the situation. Babylon shall fall by the hand of men, but by the will of God. Her fate, executed by Persia—it had been predestined by Yahweh! That voice calling to the

[38] The repetition of נפלה in MT is probably dittography (hence not contained in all LXX recensions; see Field, *Origenis hexaplarum*, a. l.). If the reading of MT is original, we would have here the only line of the oracle in which the 2-beat rhythm has been abandoned in favor of the regular, asymmetrical, *Qinah*-rhythm (3:2 || 2:2):

Naphelá naphelá Babhél | *wekhol-pesilé 'elohéha* ||
Shibbár la'áreṣ | *medhûshathí ubhen-gorní.*

In either case, however, the words ויען ויאמר stand outside of the metre and parallelism of this scene as ויקרא אריה outside of that in v. 8.

[39] Who, it thus appears, was the—suspended—subject of שבר; in MT the word is subjectless (so Ibn Ezra: שבר המשבר), unless, indeed, we follow the suggestion implied by Marti and think of—Cyrus!

shields was not a mere hallucination. Seen by the eyes of flesh, there is an attack coming forth of Elamite and Median riders headed against Babylon. But seen in the vision of the spirit, this is the war of the true and living God, of Yahweh of Hosts, against the lifeless images of the Babylonian pantheon. The God of the deprived, humiliated, subdued Israel smashes to the ground the glittering but unreal gods of hitherto triumphant Babylon. Similarly does Dan. 5 make the Hebrew sage announce before the perplexed Belshazzar, who had preferred the worship of gods made of gold, silver, stone and wood to that of the living God of Heavens, that it is this true and exalted God who had sent the uncanny hand to proclaim Babylon's prostration by the hand of Media and Persia. And similarly do also Jer. 50 and Is. 46 praise the fall of Babel not as the military victory of Cyrus' arms but as the moral victory of Yahweh over Bel, Marduk, Nabu. And if it was on no other ground but that of the profusion and verbosity in Dan. and Jer., on the one hand, and of the noble reserve and scantness of Is. 21, on the other—it would suffice to claim for our poem literary priority and independence. To the polite request of the Babylonians to be entertained by Hebrew music the psalmist answers with religious indignation: "How could we sing the songs of Yahweh on foreign land!", winding up with an impassionate prayer for revenge. And to the timid hoping inquiry of Babylon's messenger our seer answers with an oracle of the fall of Babel and her deceitful gods. A Hebrew seer, he is the seer of the true God! What I have heard from *Yahweh*—I have told unto *you*, thus addressing himself through the messenger to the Babylonians at large. Just as in the following oracle he answers to the "caller from Seir" in second person plurals. A profound seer, moved by the eternal theme of prophetic religion, has fashioned a Hebrew poem of unsurpassed dramatic art.

It is hardly necessary to point out, in addition to what has been said, the reasons that led us to deviate from the current conception of v. 10. This conception detaches two beats from the penultimate strophe, where they are wanted, and attaches them

to the last strophe, where they are superfluous and out of place. By doing so it violates all the rules of metre and parallelism so painstakingly observed by the poet. The result is that the ill-treated words have been deprived of their original connotation and given a meaning which they could hardly ever have had. There is nothing to support the curious rendering of *medhûshathî* as "my threshed one," but there is more than one reason to demand the rendering "my threshing," "my down-treading."[40] *Ben-gornî*, on the other hand, could not possibly have been intended as "my threshing-floor child." In addition to its being intolerably sentimental, out of keeping with the mood of the poem, it is bad Hebrew. All evidence, both linguistic and literary, requires "my threshing-floor *man*," "my thresher."[41] But the greatest injustice done to the poem by the current conception is making its last strophe refer to Israel. Even an elementary sense of style and syntax suffices to forbid such interpretation.[42] The confusion seems to be due to the fact that the Massorites have placed a pausal sign two words too soon—an illuminating example how an admirably well preserved text, however guarded against disintegration by the poignancy of its form, may be ruined by mere mispunctuation.

[40] Witness all the cases of noun formations analogous to מדושה, i. e. the fem. of an ע"ו stem with preformative *m*. In each case this formation denotes an abstract idea of the action expressed by the corresponding stem: מבוכה, מהומה, מנוחה, מנוסה, מצולה, מצוקה, משובה. The passages usually quoted in support of the current conception prove in reality its improbability. In Is. 41 15 Zion is promised that it will be made a *threshing-sledge*, and that it will *thresh* the mountains; in Ps. 129 3 Israel complains of *ploughers* that *ploughed* her back.

[41] Comp. the analogies in connections like בן חיל, בן שמן, בן מות, בן עני, בן עולה (and Arabic ابن السبيل, ابن الحرب, ابن الغمد). The word *ben* is used here to express the fact that someone or something has the quality of exposing an idea (that of power, of injustice, of the road, etc.), cultivating, or personifying, or owning, it. Moreover, comp. Jer. 51 33 f. See the preceding note.

[42] Notice in particular the great emphasis (of surprise and unexpectedness) laid on the relative clause אשר . . . ישראל by making it *preceded* the verb (הגדתי) upon which it depends.

Finally a word may be added concerning the superscriptions. Of those prefixed to each of the three scenes contained in vv. 6—10, the first proved to be erroneous. The second, at the beginning of v. 8, is puzzling. It reads literally "and called a lion", or "and he called: Lion"—neither of which could be originally intended. But since the third superscription, in v. 9b, reads "and he answered and said," thus evidently referring to a subject already mentioned, there is ample room for the suggestion that *'aryeh*, "lion," is miswritten for *haro'eh*, "the seer."[43] If this conjecture be correct, the author of the two superscriptions understood the last two scenes of the poem in the sense obtained by the above analysis.[44]

Even more puzzling is the superscription prefixed to the poem as a whole. The elimination of the word "sea," suggested above, lessens the difficulties considerably. But why even "Oracle of the wilderness"? If the editor responsible for this superscription intended to mark the oracle by a geographical name, why did he not choose Babel, Elam, Media?[45] Is it possible that what he intended was not *massa midbar*, "Oracle of the wilderness," but rather *massa medabber*, i. e., "an oracle speaking" or "oracle of a speaker"—expressing thereby roughly his observation of the frequent change of the speaking person in the oracle? Notice, too, that the following oracle, in which the caller from Seir does *not* obtain information from the watchman, bears the superscription "oracle of silence."[46] Is this mere coincidence or has the "speaking" oracle in vv. 1—10 been contrasted, naively, with the "silent" oracle in vv. 11—12?

[43] So also Haller ("der Seher").

[44] Mark the fine choice of verbs: ויקרא, "and he *called*" (indicating that first the prophet called to God; cf. Ex. 34 5 f., and frequently elsewhere), and ויען ויאמר "and he *answered* and said" (meaning that he *then* addressed himself to the inquirer).

[45] Or (if he was guided by what stands at the *beginning* of the oracle) Negeb which even *precedes* the "wilderness." See Is. 13 1 (Babel not being mentioned before v. 19) and 23 1 (Ṣor not being mentioned before v. 5).

[46] Both מִדְבַּר and דומה as specifications of משא would be, true enough, without analogy. But it is just as unparalleled that an *editor* should say דומה when he meant אדום (so LXX), and this in a superscription to an oracle in which neither Dumah nor Edom is mentioned.

d) *The Text*

משא מדבר

כסופות ים בנגב לחלוף
ממדבר בא מארץ נוראה

חזות קשה הגד לי
הבוגד בוגד והשודד שודד

עלי עילם צורי מדי
כַּלְּאִ נחתה השבִּתי <שבתה>

על־כן מלאו מתני חלחלה
צירים אחזוני כצירי יולדה
נעויתי משמע נבהלתי מראות
תעה לבבי פלצות בעתתני

את־נשף חשקי שם־לי לחרדה
ערך השלחן צפה הצפית
אכול שתה <ששון שמחה>
קומו השרים משחו מגן

לך־העמד המצפה אשר־יראה יגיד
וראה רכב צמד פרשים
רכב חמור רכב גמל
והקשיב קשב רב קשב

על־מצפה אדני אנכי עמד תמיד יומם
ועל משמרתי אנכי נצב כל הלילות
והנה זה־בא רכב איש צמד פרשים

נפלה בבל וכל־פסילי אלהיה
שבר לארץ מדושתי ובן־גרני

אשר שמעתי מאת־יהוה צבאות
אלהי ישראל הגדתי לכם

e) *Translation*

An Oracle Speaking[1]*:*

The Seer:

As storms of sea[2]
sweeping through the Negeb—
It cometh from the wilderness,
from a fearful land!

Babylon:

A grievous vision
has been told to me:
The traitor deals treacherously,
the violater violates!

The Seer:

Go up, oh Elam!
lay siege, oh Media!
Consume her ease!
destroy her[3] leisure[3]!

Babylon:

Therefore are filled
my loins with trembling;
Pangs have seized me
as of a woman in travail.
I am bent at what I hear,
I am dismayed at what I see:
My heart is confounded,
shuddering has affrighted me:

The eve of my delight
turned for me into terror:
Arranging the tables,
spreading the carpets:
Eating, drinking,
Joy,[3] jubilation[3]—

A Voice:

Rise up, ye Captains,
oil the shields!

[1] MT: of the wilderness.
[2] Misplaced in MT.
[3] Missing in MT.

Babylon (to a messenger):[4] Go station the seer:
what he perceives, let him tell!
And if he perceive a riding troop,
horsemen in pairs;
A riding troop on asses,
a riding troop on camels—
Let him give attention,
much attention!

The Seer (to God):[5] Upon the watch-post, oh Lord,
am I standing
continually by day;
And upon my guard-place
am I stationed
all the nights.
And lo, there, coming:
a riding troop of men,
horsemen in pairs!

(to the Bab. messenger):[5] Fallen[6] is Babylon
with all the images of her gods!
He has smashed to the earth
my down-treading and my thresher!

What I have heard
from Yahweh of Sebaoth,
The God of Israel—
have I told unto you!

[4] MT: God (to the prophet).
[5] So perh. also MT. See above and n. 44.
[6] Twice in MT.

THE HESYCHIAN INFLUENCE IN THE VERSIONS OF DANIEL[1]

HENRY S. GEHMAN
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

IT is obvious that the Septuagint was not uniform throughout the Greek-speaking world. Thus there developed minor differences in Constantinople, Syria, Palestine and Egypt; these variations are evident in the various groups of manuscripts. A study of the different versions of Daniel in Arabic, Coptic, Ethiopic, and Armenian has shown that their basis is Theodotionic; the manuscripts of the book of Daniel have now been grouped into definite families according to their pedigrees by Professor Montgomery in his *Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (New York, 1927). In my articles on the Arabic and the Sahidic and Bohairic Versions

[1] Symbols used in this essay:

- A Codex Alexandrinus
- ⲁ the "Polyglot" Arabic Version
- Arm. the Armenian Version
- B Codex Vaticanus
- ⲃ^{B} Coptic-Bohairic Version
- c Theodotion Text of the Chigi MS.
- ⲉ the Old Ethiopic Version
- 𝔊 the Septuagint or the Old Greek
- 𝔥 Hebrew-Aramaic Text
- Or^{C} Constantinopolitan-Origenian Text (A-group)
- Or^{P} Palestinian-Origenian Text (V, 62, 147)
- Q Codex Marchalianus
- 𝔖 Syriac Version ("Peshitta")
- S Ethiopic MS.—Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Éth. 11—Saint-Germain 230; Séguier = Zotenberg 7
- V Codex Venetus (Holmes-Parsons 23)

of Daniel in the JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE (XLIV, 327–352; XLVI, 279–330) I have represented in diagrammatic form this genealogical relationship.

The group closest to the Hexapla is the Palestinian-Origenian group, represented by V, 62, 147. Lucian's work, which is based on the recension of 𝔊 in Syria and influenced by the Hexapla, is represented by 22, 36, 48, 51, 231, c. The revision of the text by Eusebius of Caesarea for Constantine is represented by a special group which is very evidently based on Or^P. In this family, which may be called the A-group or more aptly the Constantinopolitan-Origenian, we find 𝔄, A, 106, 35, 42, Q, 230. 𝔄 is the best representative of this group that we have; it is far superior to A, in spite of the fact that it is a version of a version.

Codex Q, however, is a rather individual manuscript. Its text is distinctly Origenian, in its plusses and in its faults, as a comparison with A easily shows. Its independence of readings, however, has rendered Q an enigma. If we accept the hypothesis of Hesychian origin—for this is the prevailing theory—then Hesychius adapted the Hexaplaric recension to a variant basal form of Theodotion in Egypt. Running close with Q is 230, of which there is a photostatic copy at the Philadelphia Divinity School. Now, while Q and 230 both belong to the Or^C group, they are so distinct as to form a special smaller group within the Or^C family.

It is not easy to ascertain who this Hesychius was. Probably he is the Egyptian bishop, whose colabourer was Phileas, a distinguished scholar. Hesychius' martyrdom may have aided in making his version popular in Alexandria and in Egypt generally. Q and 230, while belonging to the Or^C group in a general sense, in their striking individualism probably reflect Hesychian or Egyptian readings.

Now 𝔄 is singularly free from this Hesychian influence. The Arabic-speaking Melchite Church turned to Constantinople for its text, and for the Book of Daniel we find in 𝔄 the purest and most accurate representative of the Or^C group. On the other hand the influence of Hesychius is pronounced in the Coptic versions. Thus, although the Sahidic fragments follow the Greek text of Theodotion as represented by B, there are *fifteen* cases of Origenian

contamination in the text. There are only *two* cases of Or^C influence where Q and 230 are not represented; *five* cases of Or^C where Q and 230 are represented; *one* agreement with Lucian and 230; and *two* with Q and 230 alone. The Origenian influence came in through Or^C, and the latter was the Egyptian variety, as is proved by the frequent presence of Q and 230. Where Q and 230 stand alone, we are dealing not with Origenian influence, but with an older Egyptian text.

$\mathfrak{C}^B$ is beyond the shadow of a doubt a member of the Or^C group. At the same time the influence of Q and 230 is overwhelming, as the list of examples quoted in my article in this JOURNAL (*loco citato*) proved. Its provenance from a manuscript with a pronounced Hesychian or Egyptian basis is thus accordingly assured.

We are now indebted to Löfgren for an edition of Daniel in Ethiopic, *Die Aethiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Daniel*, Paris, 1927, in which he publishes the Old Ethiopic text as represented by MS. S, which was copied probably before 1300 A. D.; the translation, according to Löfgren, was made not later than 650 A.D. In the later Ethiopic versions we have rather composite influences from $\mathfrak{G}$, $\mathfrak{S}$, and Arabic versions. MS. S represents a rather individualistic text, but is based on a Greek Theodotionic text. Löfgren connects it especially with MSS. 26, 89, 130, 230; his observations show that $\mathfrak{E}$ is particularly related to 130. In my recent study of this text I have also noticed that it follows the Or^C group in a general sense, while I also marked various striking agreements with Q, 230, and $\mathfrak{C}^B$. In other words this version is not free from Hesychian influence.

It is, of course, to be expected that the two Coptic versions should contain certain Egyptian traces. It may be rather surprising, however, to find Hesychian readings in the Armenian version. Yet such are my conclusions after having studied Daniel in the Armenian as published in the Venice texts of 1733, 1805 and 1860. In that connexion I compared all doubtful or difficult readings with the photostatic copy of MS. 230. In my studies on the Armenian version of Daniel[2] and its affinities I have noted

[2] To be published in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentl. Wissenschaft.*

fourteen cases where the Armenian uniquely agrees with Q; *ten* instances where the Armenian reflects 230; and *thirteen* passages where the Armenian uniquely depends on readings common to both Q and 230. While the Armenian in a general way agrees with the Or^C group and is a far more accurate text than A, it is also very obvious from the above evidence that Arm. with Q, 230, and $\mathfrak{C}^B$ forms a special family which depends on an Egyptian text.

This study of the Armenian text sheds an interesting sidelight on the history of Arm. as narrated by the Armenian historians. It is said that Mesrop and Sahak, after the initial translation of the Bible into Armenian, sent Joseph and Eznik to Edessa to translate from Syriac the traditions of the Church Fathers. When they had finished their duties in the latter place, these two young men went to Constantinople, where they were joined by other pupils of Mesrop, among whom was found Koriun. They spent several years at Constantinople, and after the Council of Ephesus (431) returned to Armenia with an 'accurate' copy of the Greek Bible. Upon receipt of this new copy of the Scriptures, Sahak and Mesrop immediately wished to make their version correspond to this 'accurate' copy and were very zealous to recast their Armenian text. They hardly made an entirely new translation of the whole Bible, nor is it probable that they discarded all their previous labours. But apparently they were not satisfied with their manuscript evidence. Moses of Chorene with others was sent to Alexandria with the view of making a more accurate translation. It is not entirely clear why it was necessary to send these men to Alexandria, since no doubt Mesrop, Sahak, Eznik, and the other translators were competent Greek scholars. Conybeare suggests that they probably wished to add the sections of Ammonius and the asterisks and obeli of Origen. Some Armenian manuscripts actually contain the Hexaplaric signs. As my examples of frequent unique agreements between Arm. and Q and 230 show, this visit to Alexandria was not without a decided influence on the Armenian text of Daniel; it is probable that the Hesychian or Egyptian readings were thus introduced into the Armenian version of Daniel.

DIE SPRACHLICHE GESTALT DES PENTATEUCH IN IHRER BEZIEHUNG ZUR ÄGYPTISCHEN SPRACHE[1]

VON ED. KÖNIG, BONN

WÄHREND speziell nur um das Deuteronomium in den letztvergangenen Jahren ein lebhafter Kampf geführt wurde,[2] ist nun jetzt der ganze Pentateuch nach seinem Ursprung zum Gegenstand der Untersuchung gemacht worden. Prof. Yahuda meint nämlich, die Entstehung des Pentateuch durch die Vergleichung seiner Sprache mit dem Ägyptischen in eine neue Beleuchtung rücken zu können, und hat seine neuen Ansichten in einem umfangreichen ersten Bande eines mehrteiligen Werkes vorgelegt. Aus diesem Unternehmen Yahudas erwächst natürlich für die Bibelforschung und speziell die sprachwissenschaftliche Seite derselben die Aufgabe, seine Darlegung in bezug auf die Richtigkeit seiner Methode und die Beweiskraft seiner einzelnen Argumente einer Nachprüfung zu unterziehen. Da ich nun bei meiner Mitarbeit an der Lösung des Pentateuchproblems insbesondere die sprachliche Gestalt dieses Teiles der althebräischen Literatur zum Kriterium für die Erforschung seines Ursprungs gemacht habe, so darf ich mich unmöglich der Pflicht entziehen, auch meinerseits einen Beitrag zu der erwähnten Nachprüfung darzubieten.

[1] Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung von A. S. Yahudas Buch „Die Sprache des Pentateuch in ihren Beziehungen zum Ägyptischen" (1929).

[2] Vgl. meinen zusammenfassenden Artikel „Deuteronomische Hauptfragen" (in ZATW 1929).

1. Wenn man in einem Gebiete der Wissenschaft eine neue Auffassung zur Geltung bringen will, so ist zweifellos dies das richtige Verfahren, daß man zuerst den Stand der Erkenntnis, der bis dahin auf dem betreffenden Gebiete erreicht ist, kennzeichnet und die Gründe, weshalb einem diese Erkenntnis als unbefriedigend erscheint, entfaltet. Hat Yahuda dieses Verfahren befolgt? Nein, in keiner von den beiden erwähnten selbstverständlichen Beziehungen. Denn erstens entwirft er kein Bild von dem jetzt erreichten Stande der wissenschaftlichen Forschung über den Ursprung des Pentateuch. Denn er blickt nur auf die extremsten Hypothesen, nach denen der Pentateuch in und nach dem Exil angesetzt wird, wie es z. B. bei Maurice Vernes geschieht, der die Reden der Schriftpropheten deswegen im dritten Jahrhundert entstanden sein läßt[3]. Yahuda spricht S. XXII nur davon, daß „die babylonischen Elemente in der Bibel" nach manchen erst „im 6. und 5. Jahrhundert" beim „unmittelbaren Kontakt von Hebräern mit Babyloniern" aufgenommen worden seien[4]. Dieses zugleich bequeme und zugleich ungerechte Verfahren ist mir sattsam von Ed. Naville her bekannt. Und weshalb hat er zweitens die von der methodischen Pentateuchforschung erarbeitete Auffassung des Pentateuchursprungs nicht diskutiert? Weil er meinte, dabei könne er „nur die Argumente und Gegenargumente wiederholen, die seit Jahrzehnten von Anhängern und Gegnern der bibelkritischen Hypothesen vorgebracht werden" (S. XXIII). O vor solcher „Wiederholung" hätte er sich hinreichend schützen können, wenn er nur die in der methodischen Pentateuchforschung gefundene Ansicht genau beobachten und dann den Versuch hätte machen wollen, sie mit neuen Argumenten zu widerlegen. Dieser Versuch hätte ihm um so näher liegen müssen, als er mehrmals (S. IV und XXIII) sich darauf zurückzieht, daß er „auf dem rein sprachlichen Boden bleiben wolle", und die

[3] Ausführlich diskutiert in meiner Einleitung ins AT. 298—300.

[4] Yah. operiert mit der landläufigen Entlehnungshypothese (S. XXI ff.). Die von mir im Genesiskommentar (1925), 371—76 begründete Vererbungstheorie kennt er nicht.

Pentateuchforschung nach meiner Methode in sprachgeschichtlichen Tatsachen ihre Hauptgrundlagen gefunden hat[5].

Mein sich daran anschließender Kampf um die Anerkennung der sichersten Grundlagen der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung über Israels älteste Zeit, meine erstmalige Geltendmachung der Tatsache, daß in Israels historischem Bewußtsein eine vormosaische Periode unterschieden wird (vgl. meinen Genesiskomm.[2] 83—106!), ist von Yah. ebenfalls ignoriert worden. Ich habe die Patriarchen als historische Persönlichkeiten erwiesen. Aber Yah. spricht S. XXII und XXX so, als ob kein Vertreter der Bibelkritik die Wirklichkeit der Patriarchen annehme, und er erst auftreten müsse, um dies zu tun. Ein solches unwissenschaftliches Verfahren kann nicht ungerügt bleiben. Aus einem solchen ignorierenden Verhalten erklärt es sich auch, daß Yah. von „der Sprache des Pentateuch spricht (auf dem Buchtitel, auch S. XXX, Mitte), während doch nicht bloß koätane, sondern auch sukzessive Sprachdifferenzen zwischen Abschnitten des Pentateuch von mir aufgezeigt worden sind[6]. Die verschiedenen Teile des Pentateuch stellen also nicht eine einheitliche

[5] Nachdem ich nämlich im Anschluß an meine sprachlichen Arbeiten „Gedanke, Laut und Akzent" usw. in meiner Habilitationsschrift „De argumenti etc." (1879) zum ersten Male die Gesetze des Sprachbeweises aufzustellen gesucht hatte, habe ich sie in der „Einleitung in das A.T." (1893), § 36 kürzer formuliert und zugleich auch die Literarkritik angewandt, wie man auch in m. Genesiskommentar (1925), S. 39—79 sehen kann.

[6] Um wenigstens einen einzigen Beleg hier zu geben, so begegnet für „ich" *'anokî* und *'anî* in Gen. 1—Ex. 24, aber kein einziges *'anokî*, sondern nur *'anî* in Ex. 25—Nm. 36, und diese Tatsache geht mit den folgenden beiden parallel: Auch in den Geschichtsbüchern Sam., Könige, Esra-Neh., Chron. nimmt die Zahl der *'anokî* immer mehr ab bis in Chron. nur 1 *'anokî* (aus einer Parallelstelle!) neben 30 *'anî* auftritt. Ferner im Buche Amos verhalten sich die *'anokî* zu den *'anî* wie 10 : 1, aber in Hesekiel wie 1 : 138. Alle Belegstellen aus allen Büchern sind in meiner Einl. ins A.T. gegeben, wie es dort auch inbezug auf die andern sukzessiven Sprachdifferenzen geschehen ist. Was speziell die Genesis anlangt, so sind die in ihr auftretenden Sprachverschiedenheiten natürlich auch in m. Kommentar behandelt.

Stufe der hebräischen Sprachentwicklung dar, und es kann nicht von „der Pentateuchsprache“ geredet werden.

Die Vernachlässigung des Anschlusses an den vorher erreichten Stand der Forschung zeigt sich in Yahudas Buch auch noch auf die folgende Weise. Auch vor ihm haben viele Ägyptologen Berührungen der pentateuchischen Darstellung mit Sprache und Sitte des Nillandes nachgewiesen, wie schon durch die Nennung dreier Werke hinreichend bewiesen wird: Georg Ebers, Ägypten und die Bücher Mose's (1868); H. J. Heyes, Bibel und Ägypten (1905); Erman-Ranke, Ägypten und ägyptisches Leben im Altertum (1923). Da würde es nun zweifellos methodisch richtig gewesen sein, wenn Yah. dem Leser einen Überblick über das gegeben, was seine Vorgänger schon über den formalen Zusammenhang von Pentateuch und ägyptischer Kultur ans Licht gestellt, und dann angedeutet hätte, weshalb und wie über die bisherige Erforschung dieses Zusammenhangs hinauszuschreiten sei. Aber das tut Yah. auch auf S. 3 nicht, sondern beginnt auf S. 5 sofort damit, Materialien anzuführen, durch die der erwähnte Zusammenhang beleuchtet werden soll. Auf manche Leser kann diese Art des Vorgehens den Eindruck machen, als wenn in Yahudas Buch die erste Pionierarbeit auf diesem Gebiete unternommen würde.

2. Während Yah. es demnach unterlassen hat, den Anschluß seiner Untersuchung an den bisherigen Gang der Bearbeitung seines Themas zu markieren, hat er eine andere vorbereitende Darlegung gar wohl zu geben versucht. Er will die Begründung seiner Ansicht vom durchgreifenden Einfluß des Ägyptischen auf die Entwicklung des Hebräischen durch mehrere sprachgeschichtliche und sprachphilosophische Ausführungen als schon von vornherein plausibel hinstellen.

a) Dabei hat er zunächst die Meinung vertreten, daß das Aramäische die Ursprache der Hebräer gewesen sei (S. XXX) wie es auch Naville (vgl. meinen Genesiskomm. 1925, 12) behauptet hat. Diese Ansicht beruht auf einer falschen Deutung von Deut 26, 5. Die dort stehenden Worte Israels lauten: „Ein wegirrender Aramäer war mein Stammvater und zog nach Ägypten hinab als Fremdling.“ Der Ausdruck *'ôbēd* hat dort denselben Sinn wie in

„gleich einem abirrenden Stück Kleinvieh" (Ps. 119 176a), wie ich in Zusammenstimmung mit Paul Haupt (in ZDMG 1910, 704) in meinem Hebr.-aram. WB. 1922, 666 angebe. Es bedeutet also „von seinem eigentlichen Aufenthaltsort sich wegwendend" und blickt auf die Wanderung des Stammvaters Jakob nach Mesopotamien (Gn. 28 10 ff.). Dies wird positiv durch die Fortsetzung von Deut. 26 5 erwiesen, wo mit „und zog hinab nach Ägypten als Fremdling" auf die zweite Wegwanderung Jakobs von seinem eigentlichen Aufenthaltsort hingeblickt ist[7]. Wie also Yahudas Ansicht, daß das Aramäische die Ursprache der Hebräer gewesen sei, einerseits auf einer falschen Auslegung von Deut. 26 5 beruht, so andererseits auf einer Vernachlässigung von Gen. 31 47. Denn da ist ausdrücklich erzählt, daß Laban das Denkmal des zwischen ihm und Jakob abgeschlossenen Vertrags mit den aramäischen Worten *j^e^gâr sâh^a^dûthā* „Haufen des Zeugnisses" benannte, während Jakob die hebräischen Ausdrücke *gal 'êd* gebrauchte.

b) Sodann läßt sich auch dies nicht mit Yah. (XXIV, Z. 3; XXVI, Z. 7 usw.) als sicher hinstellen, daß die Hebräer die kanaanitische Sprache „adoptiert" haben. Diese Annahme läßt sich nicht auf die Ankündigung, daß fünf Städte im Lande Ägypten „die Sprache Kanaans" sprechen werden (Jes. 19 18), aufbauen. Denn diese Bezeichnung kann dort dem Lande Ägypten einen andern Landesnamen entgegensetzen wollen. Nach den alten Erinnerungen Israels (Gen. 10 8 ff, 21 ff.; 11 28) liegt die Annahme näher, daß der Hebräer (14 13) Abrâm mit seinem Gefolge[8] bei der Auswanderung aus dem südbabylonischen Ur einen mit dem Babylonisch-Ass. verwandten Dialekt mitbrachte, der dem ähnlich war, den die nach ihrem eigenen Zeugnis (Herod. 1 1; 7 89) ebenfalls vom Süden her[9] gekommenen Phönizier gesprochen haben. Vgl. z. B. akkad. *'anâkû*, *qatlâkû*, äth. *qatalkû*, hebr. *'anôkî*, phön. *'anôk(i)*[10].

[7] Eine noch eingehendere Erörterung unter Auseinandersetzung mit Ehrlich und anderen gibt mein Kommentar zum Deut. (1917) z. St.

[8] Über „*Ḫabiri* und Hebräer" s. meinen Aufsatz in ZATW. 1928, 200 ff.!

[9] ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐρυθρῆς καλεομένης θαλάσσης (Herodot 1 1), ὡς αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν (7 89).

[10] Die wichtigen Materialien, die namentlich Rich. Lepsius in der Ein-

c) Wichtiger für die von Yah. beabsichtigte Beweisführung ist die von ihm zugrundegelegte Theorie betreffs des Werdens einer Sprache zur Schriftsprache. In bezug darauf behauptet er, daß die Sprache der Hebräer erst und nur durch deren Kontakt mit den Ägyptern zu einer Schriftsprache habe werden können und geworden sei.

Bei diesem Thema gibt er erstens auf die Frage, wann eine Sprache zur Schriftsprache werde, eine zweifelhafte Antwort. Er meint nämlich, daß dies erst in einem späten höheren Entwicklungsstadium einer Sprache geschehe. In diesem Punkte zeigt er wieder (s. o. Nr. 2, a) sich als Nachfolger des Ägyptologen Naville, der die Behauptung aufstellte, daß die Sprache Kanaans nur eine gesprochene, aber keine Schriftsprache gewesen sei, der sogar das Deboralied (Richt. 5) von den in der Schriftsprache gefertigten Literaturprodukten trennte und eine fremde Sprache als die Schriftsprache der Hebräer voraussetzte[11]. Die an Naville angelehnte Meinung Yahudas, daß eine Sprache erst in einem höheren Entwicklungsstadium als „Schriftsprache" gelten könne, beruht auf einer fragwürdigen Einschränkung des Geltungsbereichs der erwähnten Bezeichnung. Als Schriftsprache kann jede Sprache vom Anfange ihrer Existenz an gelten. Denn wenn sie zum mündlichen Ausdruck geeignet ist, kann sie auch bei schriftlicher Darstellung fungieren, sobald ein Alphabet für die betreffende Sprache gefunden ist.

Bedeutsamer aber als das, was Yah. über den Termin des Eintritts der kanaanitisch-hebräischen Sprache in die Kategorie der „Schriftsprachen" annimmt, ist seine Ansicht über die Art und Weise, wie die kanaanitisch-hebräische Sprache zur „Schriftsprache" aufgestiegen sein soll. Er meint, daß „die primitive

leitung zu seiner Nuba-Grammatik zugunsten der Überlieferung von Gen. 10, 15ff. geltend gemacht hat, sind nebst andern Momenten in m. Genesiskomm. (1925), 422f. vollständig zitiert.

[11] Die Debatte darüber bildet einen Teil der nur in meinem Genesiskommentar (1925, 2—14) enthaltenen Untersuchung über die Ursprache der Genesis, wo auch alle hierher gehörigen Arbeiten Ed. Navilles zitiert sind.

Mundart" (S. XXVII, Z. 14 usw.) der Hebräer sich nur „unter dem Einfluß des Ägyptischen zu einer literarischen Sprache emporgeschwungen hat" (ebenda, Z. 21). Sofort muß aber da doch wenigstens auf folgende Schwierigkeit hingewiesen werden. Er sagt selbst (S. XXVI unten), daß die Hebräer in Ägypten isoliert lebten, wie dies nach den Quellen (Gen. 45 10; 46 28 usw.) eine bekannte Tatsache ist. Trotzdem wagt er (S. XXVII oben) zu behaupten: „Sie müssen [!] sich schon von Anfang an (Gen. 50 2 f.; Ex. 1 16) trotz ihrer Abgesondertheit an ägyptische Verhältnisse, Anschauungen und Sitten angepaßt haben", und „ihre kanaanäische Mundart muß [!] im Laufe dieser Zeit ägyptische Elemente in sich aufgenommen und in Anlehnung an das Ägyptische sich weiter fortgebildet, erweitert, Neuprägungen im Geiste der fremden Sprache vorgenommen und auch in ihrem innern [!] Bau modifiziert haben". Nun vor der Hand ist das alles nur eine Voraussetzung Yahudas[12]. Ob sie sich bewahrheiten wird, will ich nun im folgenden untersuchen.

3. Dabei wird am zweckmäßigsten von der Beantwortung der Frage ausgegangen, ob Yahuda bei der Vergleichung des Hebräischen mit dem Ägyptischen und bei der Feststellung der Beeinflussung des Hebräischen durch das Ägyptische gewisse allgemeine Gesichtspunkte der Sprachvergleichung ins Auge gefaßt hat.

a) Wenn Produkte der Einwirkung einer Sprache auf eine andere festgestellt werden sollen, ist erstens die Frage nach der etwaigen genetischen Verwandtschaft der betreffenden beiden Sprachen aufzuwerfen. Ist das in Yahudas Buch geschehen? Ich habe nichts davon in ihm gelesen. Nun aber ist eine ursprüngliche Verwandtschaft des Ägyptischen mit dem Kanaanitisch-Hebräischen wie überhaupt des Hamitischen mit dem Semitischen in den letzten Jahrzehnten immer deutlicher erkannt worden. Vgl. nur z. B. diesen Satz: „Die Übereinstimmungen beim Pronomen, beim

[12] Das Vorausschicken von Einleitungen nicht nur zum ganzen Buche, sondern auch zu den einzelnen Abschnitten desselben, bildet einen formellen Charakterzug seiner Darstellungsweise. An vorbereitender Dirigierung des Lesers hat er es nicht fehlen lassen.

Feminin-t, beim Präfix-Verbum, bei den Verbalstammbildungselementen sind zu groß, als daß man kurzer Hand jeden Zusammenhang abweisen könnte"[13]. Demnach ist an die ägyptischen Spracherscheinungen, aus denen eine Einwirkung des Ägyptischen auf das Hebräische abgeleitet werden soll, in erster Linie die Frage zu stellen, ob die Zusammenstimmung nicht auf der Urverwandtschaft von Hamitisch und Semitisch beruhen kann[14].

b) Von ganz besonderer Wichtigkeit für die richtige Beantwortung der uns hier beschäftigenden Frage ist aber die Beachtung der Parallelerscheinungen im Leben verschiedener Sprachstämme und Tochtersprachen. Daß das Auftreten solcher Parallelerscheinungen aber eine Tatsache ist, könnte leicht durch eine Masse von Beispielen aufgezeigt werden, wenn es eines solchen Nachweises bedürfte. Ich erinnere nur an folgende wenige Erscheinungen: Fortschreitender Verzicht auf die feine Unterscheidung des Duals vom Plural im Indogermanischen und Semitischen; ebenda zunehmende Vernachlässigung der Kasusendungen und, was besonders interessant ist, Verwendung des Akkusativs als neuen Nominativs: vgl. neugriechisches *ὁ γείτονα* „der Nachbar", la ragione (von rationem!) usw., im Semitischen schon aus dem Mittelarab. beweisbar, hebr. *'árṣā* auch „das Land" usw.[15] in allen Teilen der Sprachbildung und des Sprachgebrauchs. Als eine Parallelerscheinung kann es gelten, wenn der Laut *m* zur Charakteristik von Bezeichnungen des Ortes und des Werkzeugs im Ägyptischen dient[16], wie im Semitischen das *Mêm* loci und instrumenti bekanntlich oft auftritt. Also sind die von Yah. zum Beweise seiner These vorgeführten ägyptischen und hebräischen Sprachbestandteile auch daraufhin zu prüfen, ob sie unter den von

[13] Rud. Brünnow, Urverwandtschaft des Semitischen und des Kuschitischen (in Z. für Assyr. 1893, 132ff.). Andere Literatur über dieses Thema ist in meinem Historisch-kritischen Lehrgebäude der hebr. Sprache II, 423 angeführt.

[14] Reiche Materialien zur Frage der Einwanderung aus dem kuschitischen Strich Südarabiens in das Niltal bietet mein Genesiskommentar bei 10, 8. 13

[15] In meiner komparativen Syntax des Hebräischen § 269 usw.

[16] Erman, Ägyptische Grammatik § 161; Die Hieroglyphen 1917, 56.

Yah. nicht erwähnten Gesichtspunkt der Parallelerscheinungen fallen. Um wenigstens einen Fall gleich hier beispielsweise zu erwähnen, so macht Yah. aus „Brot = Mahl“ einen „für das Ägyptische charakteristischen Ausdruck“ (S. 8). Aber erstens steht in Gen. 43 31 nur „stellt (= tragt) Speise auf!“, zweitens „Brot = Speise überhaupt“ kommt im Hebr. auch sonst vor (Lev. 3 11 usw. im WB.). Übrigens konnte „Brot = Speise“ mindestens ebensogut ein synekdochischer Ausdruck für die ganze „Mahlzeit oder Gastmahl“ werden, wie „Trinken“ ein solcher geworden ist: מִשְׁתֶּה Gen. 26 30 usw. im WB.

c) Außerdem hat Yah. die hebräische Sprache so charakterisiert: Sie besitzt „eine schöpferische Assimilationskraft, daß der fremde Ursprung der vom Hebräischen von außen her aufgenommenen Elemente kaum zu erkennen ist“ (S. XXXII, Z. 7—11). Wie sehr muß es doch auch wegen dieser dem Hebräischen — angeblich — eignenden „Assimilationskraft“, schwierig sein, eine Ägyptisierung des Hebräischen sicher zu konstatieren! Jedenfalls werden wir bei der Prüfung der nach Yah. ins Hebräische aufgenommenen ägyptischen Elemente auch diesen von Yah. selbst erwähnten, aber dann hinter S. XXXII nicht beachteten Gesichtspunkt im Auge behalten müssen. Übrigens ist auch dies bemerkenswert, daß Yah. einmal (S. V, Z. 5—7) von „ägyptischen Wörtern und Phrasen spricht, die durch den Vergleich mit dem Hebräischen selbst an Deutlichkeit gewinnen und erst dadurch in das rechte Licht zu stehen kommen.“ In diesen Worten liegt doch mindestens das Zugeständnis, daß in manchen Fällen der Vergleichung ägyptischer und hebräischer Sprachbestandteile das Ägyptische nicht sicher als der lichtspendende Faktor angesehen werden kann.

4. Nunmehr kann an die Abwägung der Beweiskraft der ägyptischen Sprachbestandteile, die nach Yah. in die hebräische Sprache eingedrungen sind, im einzelnen herangetreten werden. Bei dieser Nachprüfung des Einflusses, der nach Yah. von Ägyptens Sprache und Kultur auf „die“ Sprache des Pentateuch ausgeübt worden ist, folgt man aus mehreren Gründen der Reihenfolge, die in Yahudas Buch angewendet worden ist. Denn bei

Einhaltung dieses Weges wird es vor allem für Yah. und überhaupt jeden Leser leicht, seine Aufstellungen und meine kritischen Bemerkungen miteinander zu vergleichen. Sodann kann, wenn diese Disposition von mir befolgt wird, nicht der Anschein entstehen, als ob ich unter seinen Beweismomenten eine willkürliche Auswahl getroffen hätte.

a) Aus der Josephs- und Exodusgeschichte, mit deren Ausbeutung Yah. die Beweisführung für seine These beginnt, führt er der Reihe nach folgende Momente als Anzeichen des Einflusses der ägyptischen Sprache auf die hebräische Ausdrucksweise vor: *α*) נָשַׁק „küssen" für „speisen" (S. 6) ist nach Yah. in Gen. 41 10 dem Ägyptischen entlehnt. Dort konnte allerdings *šn* „küssen" als ein „höchst gewählter" Ausdruck für „essen" in solchen Fällen dienen, in denen ein entsprechendes Objekt, wie z. B. „eine Rinderkeule" dabeistand. Aber welche Unnatur würde es gewesen sein, dieses Verb auch objektslos für „speisen" zu gebrauchen, wie es in Gen. 41, 10 wäre! Nein, נָשַׁק besitzt dort die Grundbedeutung, die es nach dem auch in meinem WB. erwähnten arabischen *nàšaḳa* (aneinanderfügen und dadurch verbinden) besitzt, über die aber Yah. vollständig schweigt. Der Text heißt also: „Und an deinem Munde hänge mein ganzes Volk", d. h. deinem Munde (= Befehle) füge es sich oder sei es vollkommen untertan![17] — *β*) In מַשְׂאוֹת Gen. 41 34 sieht Yah. (S. 7) eine Entlehnung aus dem Ägyptischen, weil das ägyptische Verb *fʒd* „tragen, erheben, darbringen" von dargebrachten Opferspenden oder Speisen gebraucht werde. Aber diese Ableitung des hebräischen Ausdrucks in Gen. 41 34, wo es sich um „Abhub, Portion" handelt, ist zu weit hergeholt. Das hebräische מַשְׂאֵת ist auch anderwärts gebraucht (2 Sam. 11 8 usw.) und ist auch in Gen. 41 34 als eine Ableitung von dem direkt davor verwendeten Verb נָשָׂא „aufheben usw." mit *Mêm* actionis et objecti[18]

[17] Mit Recht hat also auch schon der Hellenist mit „*τῷ στόματί σου ὑπακούσεται πᾶς ὁ λαός μου*" übersetzt. Auch er hat nichts von „speisen" gesagt.

[18] Dessen Auftreten neben dem *Mêm* loci und *Mêm* instrumenti in meinem „Lehrgebäude" und WB. unablässig verfolgt worden ist.

natürlicherweise gemeint. Das dabei von Yah. als ägyptisch geltend gemachte „Brot (לֶחֶם) = Mahl“ ist schon oben S. 341 bei Nr. 3, b beurteilt worden. — γ) Bei der Besprechung von „נָתַן und שָׂם für Amtseinsetzung“ (S. 9f.), worin Yah. offenbar ohne Grund eine Entlehnung aus dem Ägyptischen erblickt, will er speziell in וְנָתוֹן 41 43 den Inf. aus dem ägyptischen Gebrauche, „den Inf. am Anfange von feierlichen Ankündigungen und öffentlichen Bekanntmachungen im imperativen Sinne“ zu verwenden, ableiten. Dies aber widerspricht dem Texte. Denn nach ihm kann וְנָתוֹן nicht bedeuten „und man setze“, sondern wenn es das vorhergehende „und sie riefen“ fortsetzte, würde es bedeuten „und sie setzten“, und dies wäre inhaltlich sinnlos, weil nur der Pharao den Joseph über das ganze Land Ägypten setzen konnte. Jenes וְנָתוֹן, von dem viele Parallelen in Syntax § 413q aufgezählt sind, bildet vielmehr die Fortsetzung von „und er (der Pharao) ließ ihn auf seinem zweiten Galawagen fahren“. Also bedeutet jenes וְנָתוֹן „und er setzte“ wie schon der Grieche es richtig mit καὶ κατέστησε wiedergegeben hat. — δ) Auch aus den Worten „als Joseph vor dem Pharao stand“ (41 46) will Yah. einen ägyptischen Gebrauch des Zeitworts „stehen“ heraushören (S. 11). Jedoch auch im Hebräischen war die zitierte Ausdrucksweise eine ganz natürliche und besitzt auch da eine erläuternde Analogie z. B. in „Jahwe, vor dem ich stehe“, d. h. zu dessen Dienst ich bereit bin (1 Kön. 17 1 usw.), woran Yah. nicht gedacht hat. Jener Satz von Gen. 41 46 meint natürlicherweise in jeder Sprache „als Joseph sich dem Pharao vorstellte und in dessen Dienst genommen wurde“. — ε) Die im Namen Gottes an den Pharao gerichtete Äußerung „Ich habe dich stehen lassen“ (Ex. 9 16) heißt „ich habe dich nicht gefällt“, wie du es schon lange verdient hättest. Daß ein hebräischer Erzähler sich so wegen eines ägyptischen Sprachgebrauchs ausgedrückt habe (Yah. 12f.), liegt ganz fern. — ζ) Bei der nächsten Nr. סִפֵּר = „preisen“ sagt Yah. gleich selbst, daß „ein lehrreiches Beispiel einer völligen Übereinstimmung des Hebräischen und Ägyptischen vorliege“ (S. 13). Wir haben demnach eine von den Parallelerscheinungen (s. o. Nr. 3, b) vor uns. Mit Unrecht führt er es also unter den Argu-

menten für seine These an. Übrigens heißt סִפֵּר in Ex. 9 16b nur „verkündigen" wie Ps. 19 2; 22 23 usw. im WB. — *η*) Die nächste Spur von Einfluß des Ägyptischen auf das Hebräische entdeckte Yah. „in der Anrede des Königs in der dritten Person" (S. 13f.). Nämlich der Erzähler ließ den Mundschenk vor dem Könige sagen: „der Pharao ergrimmte" anstatt „du ergrimmtest" usw. (41 10, 33 f.). Aber auch der Hebräer sagte: „Mein Herr ziehe hin!" (Gen. 33 14) oder „Mein Herr setze nicht!" (1 Sam. 25 25) oder „der König gedenke usw.!" (2 Sam. 14 11; 1 Kön. 1 21) usw. anstatt „zieh du usw.!" Darüber schweigt Yah. gänzlich. Im Zusammenhange damit sieht er auch darin ein Zeichen ägyptischer Einwirkung auf die hebräische Ausdrucksweise, daß in der Josephsgeschichte häufig „dein Knecht" bzw. „deine Knechte" für „ich" bzw. „wir" auftrete (S. 15). Aber er hat leider dabei nicht beachtet, daß diese Redeweise ebenso wie die Verwendung von „mein Herr" bzw. „meine Herren" für „du" bzw. „ihr" im Hebräischen ganz gebräuchlich war, wie beide Ausdrucksweisen von Gen. 18 3; 19 2 an begegnen[19]. — *θ*) Die Sitte, beim Leben des Pharao zu schwören (42 15 f.), war selbstverständlich ägyptisch (Yah. 16), aber ist nur einer von den längst erkannten Ägyptizismen, die den Hebräern zum Teil auch erst in späterer Zeit bekannt geworden sein können. — *ι*) Ist ferner der mehrfache Gebrauch von *'elohîm* in Josephs Geschichte auf ägyptischen Einfluß (S. 17) zurückzuführen? Nein. Denn erstens ist die Bezugnahme auf Gottes Geschichtslenkung auch in andern Partien der hebräischen Erzählungen (vgl. *'elohîm* z. B. in 31 5 f., 11, 13, 16, 24, 42) sehr lebendig, und zweitens kann dem israelitischen Erzähler der Josephsgeschichte, der Joseph als einen treuen Anhänger seines Volkes charakterisiert (50 24 f.), nicht zugemutet werden, daß er durch häufige Einstreuung von *'elohîm* in Josephs Ausdrucksweise ihn als einen ägyptisierenden und polytheistisch gesinnten[20] Mann kennzeichnen wollte. — *k*) Der Erzähler soll ferner Jakob

[19] Die Dutzende ihrer Stellen sind in „Stilistik" 244 und 251 f. gesammelt und aus den damaligen sozialen Verhältnissen erklärt. Yah. hat auch dieses Buch leider ignoriert.

[20] *'elohîm* soll nach Yahuda in Josephs Munde auch „Götter" meinen.

vor dem Pharao seine bis dahin verlebten 130 Jahre deshalb als „wenige" haben bezeichnen lassen (47 9), „weil der Pharao[21] ein ewig lebender Gott war" (S. 18). Eine schöne Zumutung an den hebräischen Erzähler und den Patriarchen! Sodann bezeichnet nach Yah. der Ausdruck מְגוּרָה „Wanderaufenthalt", und das soll nicht recht verständlich sein, wenn man nicht den Glauben der Ägypter ins Auge faßt, wonach das irdische Leben nur „ein zeitliches Wohnen auf der Oberfläche der Erde bedeutete" (S. 19). Indes vor allem hat Jakob in 47 9 den Ausdruck *mᵉgûrîm* „Wanderschaft" gebraucht, der, was Yah. wieder nicht beachtet hat, auch in 17 8; 28 4; 36 7; 37 1; 47 9; Ex. 6 4; Hes. 20 38 usw. vorkommt. Sodann war auch dem Hebräer das irdische Leben nur ein Pilgrimstand. Vgl. Ps. 39 13 usw. in meinem Komm. 1927 z. St.

b) Hierauf bringt Yah. einen Abschnitt über „Ägyptische Titel und Würden". Darin stellt er — *α*) מִשְׁנֶה 41 43 als „Doppelgänger (Vezier)" und als ägyptisch hin, während nur „sein zweiter Wagen" (LXX: *τὸ ἅρμα τὸ δεύτερον τῶν αὐτοῦ*) wahrscheinlich ist. — *β*) Auch אָב „Vater = Ratgeber usw." (45 8), das öfters im Hebräischen begegnet (Richt. 17 10 usw.), soll dem Ägyptischen entlehnt sein. — *γ*) In „und er setzte ihn über das ganze Land Ägypten" (41 43 b) kann kein direkter Reflex des ägyptischen Titels „Herr beider Länder" (S. 25) erblickt werden. — *δ*) Wenn auch mit „der Mann" in der Zeit des Neuen Reiches der Vezier bezeichnet wurde, so sagt doch Yah. S. 28 irrtümlich, daß Joseph so in 43 17, 19, 24 „von seinem Hausverwalter" genannt werde: Dort ist mit „der Mann" vielmehr der Hausverwalter selbst bezeichnet. Also gerade die Anwendung jenes Ausdrucks auf Joseph, die allein wichtig wäre, existiert nicht im Texte. — *ε*) Da im Ägyptischen der Dolmetscher „der Wiederholer" hieß (S. 29), so ist auch das ein Beweis dafür, daß der Hebräer seine Bezeichnung des Dolmetschers (מֵלִיץ 42 23) nicht dem ägyptischen Sprachgebrauche entlehnt hat. — *ζ*) Warum soll der Hebräer nicht selbst den Begriff und Ausdruck „Aufseher über das Haus" (43 16; 44 1, 4) be-

[21] Yahuda schreibt „Pharao". Aber weil es bekanntlich und auch nach Yah. 44 ein Titel „das große Haus" war, ist allein „der Ph." richtig.

sessen haben? — *η*) Dagegen ist es selbstverständlich, daß Ausdrücke wie צָפְנַת פַּעְנֵחַ 41 45, was Yah. S. 33 mit „Nahrung des Landes ist der Lebende" deutet, zu den anerkannten Aegyptiaca gehören. Aber damit ist zugleich gesagt, daß sie keine Grundlagen für die spezielle Aufstellung Yahudas bilden. — *θ*) Da שַׂר z. B. den Obersten der Trabanten oder der Eunuchen bezeichnet (1 Kön. 14 27; Dn. 1 7), so kann in „der Oberste der Scharfrichter usw." (Gen. 37 36; 40 2 usw.) nicht mit Yah. 35 ein spezifisch ägyptischer Sprachgebrauch erblickt werden. — *ι*) Weil סְ׳הַר (39 23 ff.; 40 3, 5) den Ausdruck סֵהַר „Einschließung, Rundung" (Hohesl. 7 3) und assyrisch *sa'ru* „Armspange" neben sich hat, ist seine ägyptische Herkunft (Yah. 38f.) zweifelhaft. — *k*) In Ex. 4 15 f. will Yah. 42 die Ausdrucksweise „und Aaron soll als dein Mund dienen" daraus ableiten, daß am ägyptischen Hofe der Ausdruck „Mund = Dolmetscher, Vertreter" der Titel eines höchsten Beamten war, und der Pharao „als Gott angesehen wurde" (S. 42). Also deshalb soll der hebräische Erzähler seinem Gott diese Ausdrucksweise in Ex. 4 15 f. zugeschrieben, und der vom Hebräer verehrte Gott soll dabei mit *'elohîm* „den Pharao gemeint haben" (Yah. 43). Ist das nicht schon an sich im höchsten Grade unwahrscheinlich? Dazu kommt, daß Yah. folgenden Umstand übersehen hat. Dem Ausdruck „dein Mund" (Ex. 4 15 f.) geht in 7 1 der Ausdruck „dein Prophet" parallel, und „Mund" ist auch sonst im Hebräischen (1 Kön. 8 15; Jes. 30 2; Jr. 15 19; 2 Chron. 6 4) ein Äquivalent für *nabî'* „Prophet", was ja nach dem arabischen *nába'a* „nuntiavit" den Sprecher κε bezeichnete. — λ) Daß der pentateuchische Gebrauch von „der Pharao" ohne Namensnennung (Gen. 12 15 usw. gegenüber 2 Kön 23 29 usw.) mit dem im Neuen Reiche (Yah. 48) zusammenstimmt, war schon früher bekannt und ist nach seiner Wichtigkeit für die Würdigung der israelitischen Überlieferung in meinem Genesiskommentar[2], S. 93 untersucht worden.

Das bisher von mir befolgte Verfahren, alle von Yah. für seine Ansicht aufgeführten Sprachbestandteile auf ihre Sicherheit zu prüfen, darf ich wohl nunmehr so modifizieren, daß ich aus den von ihm vorgeführten Materialien nur die heraushebe, die er als

die sichersten Spuren des ägyptischen Einflusses auf den hebräischen Sprachgebrauch hinstellt.

c) In dem Abschnitt „Gewöhnliche Ausdrücke und Redewendungen nach dem Ägyptischen" (S. 49ff.) bemerkt er, — *α*) in Gen. 41 15 sei „hören" für „verstehen" gesagt (S. 50). Aber er übersetzt falsch: „Du verstehst einen Traum auszulegen", anstatt „Du hörst einen Traum, um ihn auch schon zu deuten". In meinem Kommentar hätte er die richtige Übersetzung gefunden, und das also wirklich vom Text Gesagte ist viel inhaltvoller, als was Yah. in ihn hineinliest. — *β*) Für מִחְיָה „Mittel zum Leben" usw. (45 5; Richt. 6 4 usw.) nach einem ägyptischen Ursprung zu suchen (S. 51), ist überflüssig. — *γ*) In der bekannten Aussage über die schnell gebärenden Hebräerinnen (Ex. 1 19) läßt Yah. 53 den Erzähler bei חָיוֹת an „Ziegen, Schafe" denken. Demgegenüber bleibt „sie sind lebensvoll, kräftig" das allein Natürliche. Man denke sich nur Yahudas Sätze: „Die Hebräerinnen gleichen nicht den Ägypterinnen, sondern sie sind Ziegen: ehe die Hebamme zu ihnen kommt, da haben sie geboren"! Übrigens für אָבְנַיִם bestätigt Yah. die bekannte Bedeutung „die beiden Ziegel = Gebärsitz" (S. 54). — *δ*) Für „Und da die Hebammen den wahren Gott fürchteten, verschaffte er ihnen Häuser"[22] (Ex. 1 21) empfiehlt Yah. 55: „Und es geschah, da die Hebammen die Götter (d. h. die Götzenfiguren, die Pharao aufzustellen befahl) fürchteten, so machten sie (nämlich die Hebräer) für sie Behausungen" (vgl. 2 Kön. 23 7b). Aber das ist ein Phantasiestück. — *ε*) Unter עַם הָאָרֶץ (Ex. 5 5) können nicht „einfache Bürger" (Yah. 56) verstanden sein. Der Pharao muß nach dem Zusammenhange vielmehr einen verächtlichen Ausdruck haben gebrauchen wollen, wie עַם הָאָרֶץ ihn an andern Stellen (s. im WB.) meint. — *ζ*) „den Geruch stinkend machen = in Verruf bringen" (Gen. 34 35; Ex. 5 21) ist nach Yah. 56f. „genau dem ägyptischen ‚den Namen stinkend machen' nachgebildet", während doch höchstens von einer Parallelerschei-

[22] Weil sie den knabenmörderischen Befehl des Pharao aus Gottesfurcht nicht ausführten, gab Gott ihnen eine gesicherte Zukunft.

nung (s. o. Nr. 3, b) gesprochen werden könnte. Ebendasselbe ist über „Stimme Gottess = Donner" (Ex. 9 23, 28 ff.) zu urteilen.

d) In bezug auf die sprachliche Verwendung von Körperteilen muß ja wohl — α) die Ausdrucksweise „er wird deinen Kopf erheben" (40 13) als eine Reminiszenz an das ägyptische „den Kopf eines Toten hochheben = ihn zu neuem Leben erwecken" (S. 59) angesehen werden. Aber dann haben wir nur ein neues Aegyptiacum kennengelernt. — β) Der Gebrauch von „Auge" als Hauptteil des Gesichts für „Antlitz = Oberfläche" (Gen. 1 2 usw.) ist in Ex. 10 5, 15; Num. 22 5, 11 viel wahrscheinlicher, als daß der Ausdruck „das Auge der Erde" statt „das Auge des Re = Sonne" (Yah. 60f.) vom Hebräer gebraucht worden sei, und der Ausdruck „das Auge des ganzen Landes" (Ex. 10 15) spricht nicht zugunsten der Meinung Yahudas, sondern ganz dagegen. — γ) Die personifizierende (Stilistik 104) Verwendung von „Lippe" für „Ufer" (Gen. 41 3 usw.) kann nur als Parallelerscheinung (s. o. Nr. 3, b) zum Gebrauche des ägyptischen *sept* (Heyes, Bibel und Ägypten 1904, 217) gelten, also kein Argument für Yahudas These bilden. Ebenso steht es mit dem metonymischen (Stilistik 18) Gebrauche von „Mund = Befehl" und von „Hand oder Arm Gottes" für das durch sie vermittelte Eingreifen in den Geschichtsverlauf (Ex. 3 19 usw.; Yah. 63f.).

e) Auch stehende Ausdrucksweisen und sprichwörtliche Redensarten sind nach Yah. 68ff. aus dem Ägyptischen in das Hebräische übergegangen. Dahin rechnet er — α) „Und es geschah in jenen vielen Tagen" (Ex. 2 23). Aber die ägyptische Formel „Nun aber nach vielen Tagen nach diesem" ist doch ziemlich verschieden. — β) Auch z. B. die Vergleichungsformel „wie der Sand des Meeres" (Gen. 41 49) dem ägyptischen Sprachgebrauch entlehnt sein zu lassen (Yah. 73), ist unbegründet. Sie kommt ja auch 22 17; 32 13; Hos. 2 1 usw. vor. Und mußte der hebräische Erzähler den Ausdruck „alle Götter Ägyptens" (Ex. 12 12) erst von den Ägyptern lernen (Yah. 76)? Soll er diese Aussage nicht durch eigene Beobachtung haben lernen können? Yahuda geht in der Degradierung der Darstellungsfähigkeit der Hebräer offenbar zu weit.

Nachdem diese kritische Übersicht über die Materialien gegeben worden ist, die Yah. aus der Joseph- und Exodusgeschichte entnehmen zu können gemeint hat, ist als Übergang zum Folgenden dies hinzuzufügen. „Die Joseph- und Exodusgeschichte bildet", sagt Yah. S. 8 — „gleichsam das Muster, woran wir Art und Fülle der ägyptischen Sprach- und Wesenseinwirkungen auf das Hebräische feststellen können, und gibt den Maßstab für die Untersuchung anderer Teile des Pentateuch auf Grad und Richtung ihrer Beeinflussung durch die ägyptische Kultur und Sprache". Nein. Darin liegt ein schwerer Irrtum. Denn die Joseph- und Exodusgeschichte nimmt in bezug auf Israels Berührung mit Ägypten eine Ausnahmestellung ein, und der — fragliche — Grad ihrer Beeinflussung durch Ägyptisches kann nicht den „Maßstab" bilden, durch den die sprachliche oder sonstige Abhängigkeit anderer Teile des Pentateuch bestimmt werden könnte.

5. Doch werfe ich nun auch auf die Beweise einen Blick, die Yah. aus anderen Teilen des Pentateuch für die Begründung seiner These vom Einfluß des Ägyptischen auf „die Pentateuchsprache" schöpfen zu können meint!

a) Da will er gleich für den ersten hebräischen Ausdruck der Bibel, also für das bekannte בְּרֵאשִׁית ein ägyptisches Vorbild geltend machen. Denn nach ihm „erweist sich *berēšîth* bei näherer Untersuchung als eine getreue Nachbildung des ägyptischen Ausdrucks *tpj.t* für ‚Vorzeit' und ‚Urzeit'" (S. 116). Darüber kann ich nicht anders urteilen, als daß er wieder einmal die Parallelerscheinungen (s. o. Nr. 3, b) im Aufbau verschiedener Sprachen außer acht gelassen hat. Hebräisch und Ägyptisch haben jedes einen mit „Kopf" zusammenhängenden Ausdruck gebildet, und der hebräische heißt überdies „am Anfang". Vgl. die eingehende sprachliche Untersuchung darüber in meinem Genesiskomm. (1925) S. 132—138! Ferner auch das vierte Wort in der Schöpfungsdarstellung, den hebräischen Ausdruck für „Himmel", läßt Yah. nach der ägyptischen Bezeichnung des Himmels, nach dem Dual *p.tj*, gebildet sein, welcher der ägyptischen Anschauung von „zwei Himmeln" entspricht. Auf diesen Gedanken ist er verfallen, weil

er die hebräische Form *šamájim* als eine Dualform betrachtet. Aber nur das den Stamm jenes Nomens schließende *j* hat dazu geführt, daß statt *šamajîm* vielmehr nach Analogie der Dualform das leichtere *šamájim* gesprochen wurde. Oder ist auch *májim* „Wasser", woran Yah. mit keinem Ton erinnert hat, eine Dualform? Nur eben derselbe Einfluß des den Stamm schließenden *j* (äthiopisch *mãj* „Wasser"!) hat die Wirkung der Dual-Analogie veranlaßt. Beide hebräische Formen sind Plurale der Ausdehnung bzw. der Massenhaftigkeit, deren zahlreiche Parallelen in meiner Syntax § 260 bzw. § 259 vorgeführt sind[23].

b) Während ich die Besprechung der einzelnen von Yah. für seine These vorgeführten Sprachbestandteile abbrechen muß, will ich doch noch die und jene allgemeinere Anschauung zu beurteilen versuchen, die Yah. über das Verhältnis des Pentateuch zu ausländischen Kulturen entwickelt hat.

Daß die in Gen. 1—11 vorliegenden Darstellungen hauptsächlich ihren Stoffen nach aus dem verwandtschaftlichen Zusammenhange[24] oder aus lokaler Berührung der Hebräer mit andern Völkern herstammen, und daß auch die Ägypter dabei eine Rolle gespielt haben, ist ein anerkanntes Gemeingut der jetzigen wissenschaftlichen Forschung. Ob aber die Ägypter dabei den vorherrschenden Einfluß geübt haben, den Yah. nachweisen wollte (S. 284), das ist mehr als bloß fraglich. Der durch Ver-

[23] An die Besprechung dieser irrtümlichen Auffassung einer hebräischen Form darf gleich noch die Erwähnung folgender Mißverständnisse angereiht werden: אֲדֹנֵיהֶם (Gen. 40,1) übersetzt Yah. S. 15 mit „ihre Herren". Er weiß also nicht, daß nur für „mein Herr", die Singularform (*'adonî*) gebraucht wurde, während für „dein Herr" usw. die ursprüngliche Pluralform *'adonîm* „Herrschaft" (vgl. das analoge *b^e'alîm* usw. in Syntax § 263 k) verwendet ist: *'adonîka* usw. Ganz verkehrt will er also daraus, daß die Brüder Josephs dessen Hausverwalter mit *'adonî* anreden, Kapital für seine These schlagen (S. 15), indem er meint, die Brüder Josephs hätten durch den Singular *'adonî* „den Angestellten von dessen Herrn, dem Vizekönig, unterscheiden" wollen. Nebenbei sei auch an die falsche Punktation וַיְהִי (S. 68) und הַיְאֹר (S. 177) mit Dageš forte im Jod erinnert.

[24] S. o. S. 334, Anm. 4 über die von mir empfohlene Vererbungstheorie!

erbung vermittelte Zusammenklang mit babylonischen Vorstellungen und auch einzelnen Ausdrücken tritt doch deutlicher hervor in der einen Schöpfungsdarstellung (Gen. 1 1–2 3 P.), in der Anschauung vom Paradies, in den Vorstellungen über die Urväter (4 17 ff.; 5 3 ff.), in der Tradition von einer großen Flutkatastrophe (6 9 ff.), in der Sage vom Turmbau zu Babel (11 1–9). Zur Begründung dieses Urteils muß ich auf die ganz komparative Behandlung verweisen, welche die beispielsweise erwähnten Genesispartien in meinem Kommentar (1925) gefunden haben.

Ich will aber doch noch auf zwei neue Einzelheiten eingehen, die von Yah. für Ausgangspunkte wichtiger Schlußfolgerungen angesehen werden (S. 284). Erstens hält er נְעָרִים Gen. 14 24 für das Äquivalent des ägyptischen *n'rjn*, womit „eine ganz bestimmte Gattung von ausländischen Truppen im ägyptischen Heere" bezeichnet worden sei (S. 283). Aber damit hat jedenfalls das Wort נְעָרִים in Gen. 14 24 nichts zu tun. Yah. freilich läßt das Wort auch dort „den Terminus für eine besondere Gattung von Kriegern" sein, weil „es antithetisch zu Veteranen (אֲנָשִׁים) stehe". Aber damit hat er das dortige אֲנָשִׁים ganz verkannt, denn es steht ja ausdrücklich dabei, wer mit diesen „Männern" gemeint wird, nämlich Abrâms drei Bundesgenossen ʿAner, Eskol und Mamre. Diesen Anführern gegenüber bezeichnet das vorhergehende נְעָרִים die Knappen, zunächst die 318 Geübten, die in Abrâms Hause geboren waren. Zweitens soll das בְּרָכָה 33 11, womit Jakob die dem Bruder zur Begrüßung entgegengesandte Herdenabteilung bezeichnete, mit dem *bꜣrꜣkꜣ* zusammenhängen, das bei den Ägyptern in der Zeit des Neuen Reiches für „Geschenk" gebraucht wurde. Wie ganz fernliegend ist aber auch diese Annahme! Für jenes בְּרָכָה habe ich im WB² (1922), das für Yah. noch nicht existiert hat, die Bedeutung „Bewillkommnungsgabe" vorgeschlagen, die dem Verb בֵּרֵךְ „begrüßen" (Gn. 47 7; 2 Sam. 6 20; 1 Chron. 16 43) und dem speziellen Zwecke der von Jakob ausgewählten Herdenabteilung vollkommen entspricht, überdies auch in 1 Sam. 25 27 usw. in meinem WB. ganz ebendenselben Sinn besitzt.

Und was ist nun über die Schlußfolgerung zu sagen, die von

Yah. an seine Ansicht über den Zusammenhang jener beiden Ausdrücke in Gen. 14 24 und 33 11 mit ägyptischen Wörtern geknüpft wird? Er meint, Ägypter und Hebräer hätten diese beiden Wörter in dem ägyptischen Sinne und danach von Yah. in Gen. 14 24 und 33 11 vorausgesetzten Sinne dem altkanaanitischen Sprachgebrauche entlehnt und in dem alten Sinne bewahrt. Aber möchte dies auch wirklich betreffs der ägyptischen Wörter gesagt werden können, für das Hebräische ist diese Schlußfolgerung zugleich mit der von Yah. grundlos in Gen. 14 24 und 33 11 vorausgesetzten Bedeutung dieser Wörter abzulehnen. Also kann auch nicht mit Yah. davon geredet werden, daß aus den in Gen. 14 24 und 33 11 vorkommenden beiden Ausdrücken auf die Entstehungszeit der betreffenden Abschnitte geschlossen werden könne.

So habe ich auch wieder an diesen zwei Ausdrücken gezeigt, daß wir das, was Yah. auch noch einmal am Schlusse seines jetzt erschienenen Buches (S. 285) über die Rücksichtnahme hebräischer Erzähler auf die ägyptische Ausdrucksweise bemerkt, als unbegründet erscheinen muß. Der Hebräer hatte doch auch seinen eigenen Sprachgebrauch. Dies darf gegenüber der Neigung, ihm schülerhafte Abhängigkeit von fremden Formenmustern zuzuschreiben, ebensowenig vergessen werden, wie die Tatsache, daß er eine in ihrem Zentrum eigenartige hohe Kultur besaß, gegenüber der jetzt weithin herrschenden Geneigtheit, den Inhalt seiner Literatur unter dem Gesichtspunkt des Milieu zu betrachten und darnach zu nivellieren. Dies darf jedenfalls zur Abkühlung der Rivalität bemerkt werden, die wir zwischen den Assyriologen[25] und dem Ägyptologen (vgl. in Yahudas Buch z. B. S. 114) bei der Verteilung des A.T. beobachten.

6. Yahuda schreibt am Ende seiner „Einleitung" (S. XXXII): „Mit dieser Arbeit ist der Grundstein zu einer neuen Auffassung des Pentateuch gelegt." Kann dies anerkannt werden? Nach den Urteilen, die oben teils über seine Ignorierung des wirklichen gegenwärtigen Standes der Pentateuchforschung (s. o. Nr. 1), teils über

[25] Vgl. mein Schriftchen „Die moderne Babylonisierung des Alten Testaments" (1922).

mehrere seiner literaturgeschichtlichen (s. o. Nr. 2) und sprachwissenschaftlichen (s. o. Nr. 3) Voraussetzungen und teils über eine lange Reihe seiner einzelnen Beweismomente (s. o. Nr. 4 und 5) gefällt werden mußten, vermag ich seinen Anspruch nicht anzuerkennen. Die von ihm aus dem ägyptischen Schrifttum beigebrachten Materialien bilden gewiß ein wichtiges Ferment für die weitere Erforschung des Problems, das vom Pentateuch der Wissenschaft gestellt wird, aber daß sie eine sichere Grundlage für eine neue Lösung dieses Problems darbieten können, das muß ich nach den oben vorgelegten Erörterungen leider verneinen.

EINIGE GESCHICHTLICHE STÄTTEN IM NORDEN JERUSALEMS

GUSTAF DALMAN, GREIFSWALD

1. Rahels Grab. Nach 1. Sam. 10 2 befand sich Rahels Grab „an der Grenze" oder „im Gebiete" Benjamins, und zwar an dem Wege, den Saul auf der Rückkehr von Samuel und dem Lande Zuph nach Gibea nahm. Da Saul gleich nachher auf Männer trifft, die nach Bethel wollen, liegt die Annahme nahe, daß es am Wege von Gibea nach Bethel liegt. Wenn die zuphitische Seherstadt das heutige *rentis* war, wie Eusebius annahm[1], so wäre Saul von dort über *'abūd*, *tibne* und *bīrzēt* heimwärts gezogen. Kurz vor dem Naturteiche *el-bālū'* kam er auf die jetzige Fahrstraße Jerusalem—*nāblus* und noch vor *el-bīre* auf den alten Weg von *bētīn* nach Gibea. An ihm wird man Rahels Grab zu suchen haben. Keinen Fingerzeig für die nähere Lage gibt die Nennung von Zelzach als Ort des Grabes in 1. Sam. 10 2. Wenn dies mit Zela (s. u.) identisch ist, würde nur die Nähe von Gibea daraus folgen. Aber die LXX geben es mit *αλλομενους μεγαλα* wieder. Sie haben also wohl צלחי רבם gelesen, das vielleicht auf צדים בכם zurückgeführt werden kann und dann nur bedeutet, daß Sauls Vater dort Leute auf seinen Sohn und dessen Begleiter „lauern" ließ.

Zu der Lage des Grabes südlich von Bethel stimmt, daß sich Jakob nach 1. M. 35 16 auf dem Wege von Bethel nach dem Süden befindet, als Rahel über der Geburt Benjamins stirbt. Aber dies

[1] Vgl. PJB. 1913, S. 38.

soll eine kurze Strecke vor Ephratha geschehen sein, und es heißt in V. 19 (vgl. 48 7) „Und sie ward begraben am Wege nach Ephratha, das ist Bethlehem, und Jakob errichtete einen Denkstein über ihrem Grabe, das ist das Mal des Grabes Rahels bis zu diesem Tage", wonach die Stätte des heutigen Rahelgrabes an der Hebronstraße, $1^1/_2$ km vom judäischen Bethlehem,[2] gemeint ist. Dieser Stadt gehörte nach 1. Sam. 17 12; Ruth 1 2; 4 11; Mich. 5 1 einer ephrathischen Sippe an, was 1. Chron. 2 50 f. dadurch erklärt wird, daß der Stammvater der Bethlehemiten aus Kalebs Ehe mit Ephrath stammte. Die Tradition des bethlehemitischen Rahelgrabes, welche Matth. 2 17 vorausgesetzt ist, stimmt nicht zu 1. Sam. 10 2 (s. o.), und auch nicht dazu, daß Jerem. 31 15 Rahel als die Stammutter Ephraims in Rama, offenbar aus dem Grabe heraus, über das Geschick ihrer Söhne jammert. Entweder hat es schon in älterer Zeit ein Rahelgrab in judäischem Gebiet gegeben, oder es befand sich in der Gegend von Rama ein Ephrath oder Ephratha, das die Erzählung von 1. M. 35 meinte und nur durch Mißverständnis von einem Glossator für Bethlehem erklärt wurde. Von diesem Ephrath haben wir sonst keine Nachricht, wenn es nicht das benjaminitische 'Ophra, LXX Jephratha, von Jos. 18 23 ist, was als möglich gelten muß, da das ephraimitische 'Ephron oder 'Ephrajin von 2. Chr. 13 19 in 2. Sam. 13 23 Ephraim genannt wird[3].

Da wir das Grab Rahels nicht sehr weit von *er-rām* entfernen dürfen und es auch in der Nähe der Meridionalstraße suchen müssen, empfiehlt sich wohl am meisten dafür die Gegend von *charāib er-rām* westlich von *er-rām*. So heißen jetzt Reste von Gewölben, die voraussichtlich einem mittelalterlichen *chān* angehören, ohne erkennbare Spuren einer alten Ortschaft. Durch Steinbruch ist das natürliche Aussehen der Umgebung völlig zerstört. Aber man sagte mir, es hätten sich da alte Gräber befunden, die als *ḳubūr el-'amāliḳa* „Amalekitergräber" bekannt waren[4]. Hier würde man

[2] Die Lage ist zu ersehen in: *Dalman*, Hundert deutsche Fliegerbilder aus Palästina, Nr. 31.

[3] Vgl. PJB 1913, S. 71.

[4] Vgl. Fliegerbilder, Nr. 22.

gern das Rahelsgrab suchen. Ephrath müßte, wenn es hier lag, weiterhin unmittelbar an der Straße gelegen haben, weil es 1. Mos. 35 16 so aussieht, als habe Rahel die nächste Ortschaft am Wege nicht mehr erreicht. Dann bliebe nur *chirbet el-ḥāuānīt* an der Wegscheide der Meridionalstraße und der Küstenstraße oder eine Ortslage an der Wasserscheide wie *chirbet ʿasākir* übrig. Nach Macalister[5] sollte man für den Weg Jakobs und Sauls aber gar nicht die Straße an der Wasserscheide voraussetzen, sondern den Weg des Assyrers nach Jes. 10 28 ff., der über Michmas und Geba nach Jerusalem geht und wahrscheinlich in Bethel seinen Ausgangspunkt hat. Dafür spricht ihm, daß sich im Tale nördlich unterhalb *ḥezme* gewaltige Hünengräber befinden, welche als *ḳubūr beni isrāīn* „Gräber der Israeliten" bekannt sind. Aber der Weg von *bētīn* über *dscheba'* nach Gibea ist gegenüber dem Wege über *el-bīre* ein so großer Umweg, der außerdem mit der Schwierigkeit der Kreuzung von zwei tiefen Tälern (*wādi eṣ-ṣwēnīṭ* und *wādi el-ḥāfi*) behaftet ist, daß niemand ohne besondere Veranlassung ihn benützen würde, um südwärts nach einem Ziele an der Meridionalstraße zu ziehen. Wenn nach Jesaja ein assyrisches Heer ihn nehmen sollte, ist dies nur dadurch zu erklären, daß ein unverhoffter Überfall, nicht ein bloßer Heranzug auszuführen war[6]. Auch Macalister macht nicht klar, welche besonderen Gründe Jakob oder Saul auf diesen unnötigen bösen Weg, den ich oft, aber wohl nie zur Freude meiner Begleiter geritten bin, gewiesen hätten. Dazu kommt, daß das Grab Rahels sich an dieser Stelle nicht bei Rama befunden hätte, welches in der Luftlinie $3^1/_2$ km davon abliegt und von ihm durch Höhen und Täler getrennt wird. Eine noch andere Ansetzung des Rahelgrabes durch die Tradition ist von Schick bezeugt worden und hat sogar in die von Guthe redigierte Wandkarte von Palästina Aufnahme gefunden. Das Grabheiligtum des *ʿabd el-ʿazīz* auf einsamer Berghöhe südlich von *bēt sūrīḳ* soll nämlich von den Bauern als Rahelgrab bezeichnet worden sein. Aber meine Nachfragen daselbst ergaben keinerlei Anhalt dafür, *ḳubbet rāḥīl* bei Bethlehem ist das einzige von Juden

[5] PEFQ 1913.

[6] Vgl. PJB 1916, S. 4 ff., Albright, Annual of ASOR IV, S. 134.

und Moslems verehrte Grab der Rahel. Schicks Mitteilung muß auf einem Mißverständnis beruhen. Dazu kommt, daß *schēch 'abd el-'azīz* von allen Verkehrswegen weitab liegt und zu den Voraussetzungen der biblischen Erzählungen vom Rahelsgrabe nicht stimmt. Es wird nichts übrig bleiben, als zu der gewöhnlichen Annahme zurückzukehren und das Grab der Rahel an der Straße von *el-bīre* nach Jerusalem zu suchen.

2. Die Thaboreiche (*ēlōn tabōr*) ist nach 1. Sam. 10 3 eine Örtlichkeit am Wege von Gibea nach Bethel und zwar südlich vom Grabe Rahels, aber doch nicht allzu nahe an Gibea, weil die Beschenkung Sauls mit Brot an dieser Stelle keinen Sinn hat, wenn er schon fast zu Hause war. In dieselbe Gegend gehört notwendig Baal Thamar, wo nach Ri. 20 33 die Israeliten nach der Scheinflucht vor Gibea haltmachten, um gegen die Benjaminiter loszubrechen, sobald der „im Westen Gibeas" (vgl. LXX) aufgestellte Hinterhalt sie von Gibea abgeschnitten haben würde. Diese Örtlichkeit, nach dem Namen ein Heiligtum, konnte nur nördlich von Gibea an der großen Straße liegen, und zwar südlich von *chirbet 'aṭṭāra*, weil dieser Haltepunkt naturgemäß nicht im *wādi dschiljān* oder hinter demselben zu suchen ist, sondern vielmehr an einer Stätte mit freiem Ausblick über die Umgebung von Gibea. Eusebius und Hieronymus kannten ein Dörfchen Beth Thamar (Hier. Beththamari) in der Nähe von Gibea. Wir kommen damit notwendig in dieselbe Gegend, in welcher die Thaboreiche lag, die auch ein Heiligtum gewesen sein wird, so daß die Vermutung erlaubt ist, daß Baal Thamar und die Thaboreiche dasselbe war und daß die Thaboreiche in Wirklichkeit Thamareiche geheißen hat. Das dazugehörende Dörfchen könnte *chirbet erḥa* gewesen sein, wenn nicht das Rahelgrab über *charāib er-rām* hinaus etwas weiter nach Norden zu schieben ist. In diesem Falle könnte *chirbet erzīje* in Frage kommen.[7]

3. Nicht dasselbe wie Baal Thamar ist wohl die Palme Deboras (*tōmer debōrā*), unter welcher nach Ri. 4 5 die Prophetin Debora Recht gesprochen haben soll, obwohl die Namen einander verwandt sind und die Thamareiche auch einmal eine Palme gewesen

[7] Vgl. Fliegerbilder, Nr. 23.

sein könnte. Daß die Prophetin Debora, deren Einfluß nur für Nordpalästina geschichtlich feststeht, wirklich „zwischen Rama und Bethel auf dem Gebirge Ephraim", wie hier gesagt wird, ihren Sitz hatte, ist auffallend. Aber es muß eine Deborapalme wirklich hier im Süden gegeben haben, und zwar zwischen Rama und Bethel. Die Bestimmung ist auffallend, weil jetzt an dem Wege zwischen beiden Ortschaften, das bedeutende Dorf *el-bīre* liegt. Wenn dies ein altes Beeroth war, wie manche glauben, sollte angegeben sein, daß die Palme entweder zwischen Beeroth und Bethel oder zwischen Beeroth und Rama oder endlich bei Beeroth stand. Die Ortsangabe sieht aus, als habe zwischen Rama und Bethel keine nennenswerte Ortschaft gelegen. Der Ort, wo die Israeliten Recht suchten, befand sich sicher nicht abseits im Gebirge, sondern an der großen Heerstraße zwischen jenen beiden Städten. Dann wäre ein recht geeigneter Punkt dafür gerade die Gegend von *el-bīre*, bei dessen starker Quelle unmittelbar am alten Wege sich die Deborapalme gut denken ließe[8]. Dieser Punkt wurde dann noch zu Ephraim gerechnet, wogegen nichts einzuwenden ist. Bethel ist ephraimitisch nach Ri. 1 23 ff.; 20 26; 21 2; 1. Chr. 7 28 und die natürliche Grenze zwischen dem Gebirge Ephraim und dem Gebiet Benjamins bildet der Sattel von *el-bīre*, auf dessen Südseite der Bereich des zweifellos benjaminitischen *wādi ed-damm* anhebt. Die nächste Ortschaft war im Norden Zemarajim (s. u.), im Süden *tell en-naṣbe*, in welchem wir Mizpa vermuten. Ihre Erwähnung konnte wegfallen, weil sie nicht unmittelbar am Wege lag. Die Vermutung ist erlaubt, daß der Name *el-bīre* mit Debora zusammenhängt. Es ist jedenfalls nicht ursprünglich arabisch, sondern hat ein Fremdwort als Hintergrund.

4. Ein vierter Punkt der Gegend war die „Klageeiche" (*allōn bākhūt*), bei welcher nach 1. Mos. 35 8 Debora, die Amme Rebekkas, begraben wurde und man also um sie klagte. Es ist schwerlich zufällig, daß derselbe Name mit jener Palme und dieser Eiche in Verbindung gebracht wurde. Aber sie hat doch mit der Deborapalme nichts zu tun. Denn sie befand sich, wie 1. Mos. 35 8 klärlich sagt, „unterhalb Bethels". Dieser Ausdruck schließt nicht uns,

[8] Fliegerbilder, Nr. 24.

das etwa ebenso hoch gelegene und durch ein Tal getrennte *el-bīre* aus, sondern wohl auch das Tal zwischen beiden, weil es durch einen höheren Rücken von Bethel geschieden ist und also nicht unterhalb desselben liegt. Unterhalb von Bethel liegt wohl auch das flache Nebental, das seinen Hügel im Westen und Süden umzieht, vor allem aber das tiefere Haupttal (*wādi eṭ-ṭaḥūne*) im Osten. In diesem würde man zuerst die Klageeiche suchen, also in den Feigengärten, welche jetzt den Talgrund bedecken, und zwar nicht weit ab von dem Wege, der von Jericho an *burdsch bēṭīn* vorüber zur Meridionalstraße des Landes hinaufführt. Wo der Weg die Höhe überschreitet, jetzt in einem unnatürlichen Bogen um das Grundstück von *burdsch bēṭīn* herumführend, ursprünglich geradeaus nach Westen gerichtet, da suchen wir auf seiner Nordseite das alte Jakobsheiligtum, wo er dann das Tal schneidet, um auf der anderen Seite Bethel südlich zu berühren, die Klageeiche (s. Fliegerbilder Nr. 27).

Hierher paßt auch das Bochim[9], zu welchem nach Ri. 2 1 der Engel Jahves von Gilgal heraufkam. Man sucht es auf der Höhe des von Gilgal heraufführenden Weges und bei einem wichtigen Heiligtum der Israeliten. Die LXX bezeichnen mit Recht Bethel als seine Stätte, *allōn bōkhīm* wird die vollständige Bezeichnung sein. Der Klageeiche wird hier eine neue Deutung gegeben durch das bußfertige Weinen der Israeliten bei den Strafworten des Engels. Ein Weinen vor Gott in Bethel spielt auch in Ri. 20 23, 26; 24 2 eine hervorragende Rolle. Die Benennung der Stätte nach dem Weinen ist jedenfalls das Ursprüngliche, die Deutung des Weinens unsicher.

5. In die Gegend von Bethel gehört auch die Terebinthe (*ēlā*), unter welcher der Prophet aus Juda nach 1. Kön. 13 14 rastete, als er auf einem „anderen Wege" von Bethel in sein Land zurückkehrte. Die Sage von ihm haftete an einem Grabe in Bethel (V. 30ff.). Der „andere Weg" von Bethel nach Juda ging naturgemäß entweder über Ai und Michmas, oder — am kürzesten — über *burḳa* und Geba oder Rama. Die Terebinthe, von welcher der Artikel nicht besagen muß, daß sie eine bestimmte und wohlbe-

[9] Es wird vielleicht auch Mi. 1 10 erwähnt, s. LXX.

kannte war, wäre also an einem dieser Wege zu suchen. Die Erzählung setzt voraus, daß damals wie heute Schattenbäume nicht häufig waren und man einen solchen Baum gern zu einer Rast benützte. *schēch schēbān* am Wege nach *burḳa* ließe sich als ein geeigneter Platz vorschlagen.

6. Eine bestimmte Örtlichkeit ist der Berg von Zemarajim im Gebirge Ephraim, von welchem aus König Abia nach 2. Chr. 13 4 eine Ansprache hielt an König Jerobeam und sein Heer, die gegen ihn ausgezogen waren. Naturgemäß muß man diesen Berg an der großen Heerstraße nach Norden suchen. Genaueres kann man daraus schließen, daß der Feldzug, der sich an die Rede schließt, nach V. 19 Bethel, Jesana und Ephron mit ihren Töchtern in den Besitz Judas bringt. Bethel ist *bētīn*, Jesana wohl *burdsch el-lisāne*, Ephron *eṭ-ṭaiḥibe*. Das bedeutet, daß das Gebiet Judas an der Hauptstraße über *bētīn* hinaus bis zur Gegend der *'ejūn el-ḥarāmīje* vorgeschoben wurde und daß nach Osten zu die Bergkette von Baal Hazor (*el-'āṣūr*) die Nordgrenze bildete. Daraus muß man schließen, daß Abia sich vor dem Kampfe südlich von Bethel befand. Wenn man nun die beiden gewaltigen Heere (400000 Judäer und 800000 Israeliten) mit der Phantasie des Erzählers in dieser Gegend durch einen Berg getrennt einander gegenüber sieht, so bietet sich kein anderer Berg für die Rede des Königs dar als der westlich hart an der Straße gelegene *rās eṭ-ṭaḥūne* (893 m)[10], von dessen nach allen Seiten hin außer nach Osten alles überragender Spitze man eine entzückende Fernsicht hat bis zum Mittelmeer im Westen und der Gegend von Etam und Tekoa jenseits Jerusalem im Süden, während man im Norden und im Nordosten die beiden Zweige der Nordstraße überschaut, bis der eine ins Tal von *dschifna* hinabsteigt, der andere den Höhenrücken jenseits *bētīn* überschreitet. Am Fuß des Hügels laufen die beiden Wege zusammen, es fehlt auch nicht an einem weiten Gelände, das als Lagerplatz für das Heer der Israeliten gedacht werden kann. Jenseits des Berges beginnt das Land des Nordens, diesseits befindet man sich im Horizont von Jerusalem. So hat also

[10] S. Fliegerbilder, Nr. 25, 26.

der *rās eṭ-ṭaḥūne* ein schwer bestreitbares Recht, als der Berg Zemarajim zu gelten. Man sollte aber sagen, der Berg von Zemarajim, denn er hieß gewiß nach der Ortschaft dieses Namens[11], welche Jos. 18 22 zwischen Beth ha-Araba und Bethel als benjaminitisch aufgeführt wird. Jetzt ist der in Felsterrassen zu einer schmalen Spitze aufsteigende Berg mit Weingärten bedeckt. Nur die Spitze trägt eine kleine Ruine, die wohl als Feldturm gemeint ist. Der heutige Name scheint zu bedeuten, daß da einmal eine Windmühle war. Als alte „Ortslage" ist der Berg nicht erkennbar, das schließt nicht aus, daß sich einmal eine Ortschaft hier befand. Die beherrschende Lage nahe an der Straße spricht sehr dafür. Die Trümmer könnten verschwunden sein, weil sie zum Aufbau von *el-bīre* dienten. Dann müßte man sich das alte Zemarajim auf dem nach ihm genannten Berge denken. Es wäre die Vorgängerin von *el-bīre* gewesen. Die Ortschaft wäre wie so oft aus einer festen Lage nach der Nähe der Quelle hinuntergewandert.

[11] Eusebius Σερειμ, lies Σεμρειμ, Hieronymus Semri.

SOME RECENT INTERPRETATIONS OF SECOND ISAIAH

GEORGE DAHL
YALE UNIVERSITY

I

Time was when interpreters of Isaiah 40—66 were almost unanimously agreed as to the background and date of these significant chapters. Babylonia was accepted as the place of writing, and 540 B. C. as the approximate date of composition. One specific bit of evidence, in particular, seemed to anchor the whole group of poems securely to the so-called 'exilic' period of Hebrew history. This was the reference, in the two succeeding verses 44 28 and 45 1, to Cyrus by name. What clearer proof could there be that the prophet penned his lyrics in the times just preceding the final triumphs of the great Persian conqueror, and that he himself was one of the exiles in Babylon longing for deliverance?

Coupled with this agreement regarding place and date was a general consensus of opinion as to the exceedingly high quality of the literature. Both on the score of superb literary craftmanship and of illumined spiritual insight the author was ranked among the outstanding geniuses of all time. Only a very few, such as Homer, Shakespeare and the writer of Job, were deemed worthy to be compared with him.

However, this harmony of opinion regarding Second Isaiah was destined to come to an end. As time went on the body of literature was subjected by scholars to ever more detailed and intensive scrutiny. It soon became evident that, so far at least as several

of the later chapters were concerned, neither Babylonian origin nor 'exilic' date could longer be maintained. Certain passages quite clearly presupposed a Palestinian background far removed from the age of Cyrus.[1] When these sections were written the temple had already been rebuilt, and the ritual was being carried on in full sway. This evidence, all inherent in the book itself, was so cogent that interpreters were forced to do something about it. Their procedure was to lop off shorter or longer portions, here a little, there a little more. This attempted solution of the problem was, as the sequel proved, quite the most unfortunate possible. The passages thus amputated were variously ascribed to Second Isaiah himself after his supposed return to Palestine, or to later (and inferior!) imitators. Duhm's commentary,[2] issued in 1892, marks in a sense the culmination of the movement. In this brilliant, if erratic, work chapters 56—66 were separated from the preceding poems. To this group the fateful term 'Trito-Isaiah' was applied. Subsequent interpreters of the book have quite generally accepted Duhm's division and appellation. As a matter of fact it would appear that 'Trito-Isaiah' has developed into a mischievous Frankenstein of modern criticism. It certainly has pretty effectively blocked independent and thorough-going investigation of the critical phenomena of Isaiah 40—66.

Now, to be sure, the basic premise of Duhm and his followers was sound. It can hardly be doubted that, as already suggested, portions at least (and this includes chapters 56—66) of Second Isaiah belong in the Westlands at a relatively late period. The fundamental error in Duhm's work lay in the violent and unjustifiable separation of his 'Trito-Isaiah' from its neighboring and related chapters. Every consideration of vocabulary, style, literary device, personal idiosyncracy, point of view, thought and message protests strongly against such a procedure. That Isaiah 40—66 constitutes an essen-

[1] See, most recently, Causse (*Les Dispersés D'Israël*, 1929, pp. 34 ff.), who inclines to accept Duhm's theory of Phoenicia as the place of writing. He also, incidentally (pp. 95ff.), accepts the same scholar's 'Trito-Isaiah'; on which see the immediately following discussion.

[2] *Das Buch Jesaia.*

tial unity[3] is just as true today as it was when earlier scholars first recognized the fact.

The separation of 56—66 has been defended by many on the ground that these chapters are inferior to 40—55 in thought and literary quality. It is claimed that the later chapters are the product of a servile school of imitators, mere epigones. These aspersions, however, are hardly consonant with the evidence of the book itself. Granted that in these chapters, as elsewhere, some poems are better and some not so good. Where, on the other hand, will one find a more resplendent and worthy picture of the Messianic age than that contained in chapter 60, beginning with the summons: "Arise, shine, for thy light is come"? Nor is the beautiful and touching portrait of the 'Servant' in chapter 61 dependent for its power upon the circumstance that Jesus quoted part of it in the Nazareth synagogue;[4] it is inspired literature by its own inherent right. Carefully studied and properly understood, the poems in 56—66 reveal themselves as of the some essential texture and quality as their companion masterpieces in 40—55. 'Trito-Isaiah', it would indeed seem, is a figure that creates many more problems than it solves.

It is important to notice that the process of disintegrating Second Isaiah did not so much as pause with the separation of 56—66 from the writings of the Great Unknown. Scholars kept on paring down the book after the manner of Duhm. A truly imposing array of authorities have definitely branded the so-called 'Servant Songs' as secondary material. Moreover, as it became increasingly apparent that not only 56—66 but also large sections of 40—55 belonged in Jerusalem during the Persian period, considerable additional material was subtracted. Consider, for instance, the somewhat extreme and yet typical case of Cheyne's Polychrome *Isaiah*.[5] All that is there left of Second Isaiah is 40—48; and even this poor remnant is subjected to vigorous reducing treatment! Once an impressive and commanding figure, Second Isaiah has

[3] On chapters 34f. see below, p. 368.

[4] Luke 4 16 ff.

[5] In Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament.*

thus sadly shrunk, alike in size and importance, under the deft hands of his interpreters. Hardly enough remains to prove that he once lived and wrote—certainly far from enough to justify one in ranking him among the first geniuses of the race. Perhaps the saddest feature of the whole process lies in this fact that, as the book is progressively reduced in extent, its greatness is more and more denied. A melancholy torso of what may once have been a great piece of literature—this is all that remains of Second Isaiah. And even that torso is largely concealed amidst a clutter of debris left, it is alleged, by later workmen of inferior skill and taste! Is it not apparent that along these lines we have come perilously near to a *reductio ad absurdum?*

II

It is with an emotion akin to wistfulness that, in view of the prevalent confusion worse confounded, one approaches the more recent interpretations of Second Isaiah. Is there, we ask, no balm in Gilead to heal this grievous hurt of modern scholarship?

Specifically, our task is to make a brief examination and evaluation of three commentaries published in English within the last few years. These are, in the order of appearance: (1) *Deutero-Isaiah*, by Reuben Levy, London, 1925; (2) *The Book of Isaiah*, New and Revised Edition, by George Adam Smith, Garden City, N. Y., 1927; and (3) *The Second Isaiah*, by Charles Cutler Torrey, New York, 1928. To what extent, we inquire, have these furthered a more correct understanding of the book, and a truer appreciation of the poet-prophet himself?

As a preliminary to the discussion of more detailed subjects, it may not be amiss to attempt a summary characterization of each of the works named. Levy, we notice, writes from the point of view of liberal Jewish scholarship. An unusual proportion of the introductory discussion is accordingly devoted to the influence of Deutero-Isaiah on the Apocrypha, the Talmud, and the later Jewish writings. This feature, in fact, constitutes the most valuable and distinctive contribution of the book.

Sir George Adam Smith has carefully worked over his bril-

liant commentary originally published in the *Expositor's Bible* some forty years ago. The aim remains primarily homiletical, always, however, on the basis of ample and exact scholarship. So far as the author's critical positions and conclusions are concerned, practically no important change is to be observed. Account is taken of scholarly work done since 1890; but of course the plan of the commentary forbids very extended and technical discussion of opposing views. The Biblical material is arranged topically in part, the object being to present logical and connected units rather than to preserve intact the original order and structure of the poems. In common with the other volumes under examination, a full translation accompanies the exposition of the text.

The plan of Torrey's book is threefold: a) a stimulating introduction covering over 200 pages; b) a worthy translation of the text, with metrical divisions indicated; and (c) some 200 pages of critical notes on the individual poems. Two features call for special notice: first, the decided break with the Duhm tradition of 'Trito-Isaiah'; and second, a prevailingly guarded attitude toward certain extreme tendencies in much modern textual criticism. Of the three commentaries under consideration, Torrey's would seem to be not only the most thorough-going and independent critically, but also the most creatively original. In view, furthermore, of its definite cleavage with the disintegrating trend of scholarship which has brought us to the present impasse,[6] this work will of right demand special attention.

III

Turning now to the more systematic survey of the contributions made by these several interpreters, we will consider questions of (1) unity; (2) text; (3) meter and strophe; (4) historical background; and (5) appreciation.

1. Unity.

Levy's limitation of his commentary to chapters 40—55 indicates in advance his adverse verdict as to the unity of Isaiah

[6] Cp. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah*, pp. 3ff., on "The Eclipse of a Great Prophet."

40—66. To Trito-Isaiah, "a junior contemporary of Malachi's who wrote in Palestine,"[7] he assigns 60—62. The remainder of 56—66 belongs to various writers. "The wider and more generous aspect of the Deutero-Isaiah's teaching is not equally marked in these chapters . . . Yet the more generous spirit of the master is not absent."[8] Four "Servant" poems—42 1–4; 49 1–6; 50 4–9; 52 13–53 12—are, as usual, recognized. These are described as "probably an independent cycle of passages, not original in their present context."[9] They are, nevertheless, the composition of Second Isaiah. "They would seem to have been inserted separately into the body of the work as quotations by the prophet himself wherever the course of his thought seemed to demand it"[10]—certainly a highly artificial view of the literary process! Chapters 40—48 are placed by Levy in Babylon, while 49—55 were "orally delivered in Palestine immediately after the return."[11] The question of the possibility of any part of chapters 1—35 belonging to the Second Isaiah is not raised.

Principal Smith holds fast to the "provisional conclusion that Second Isaiah is not a unity, in so far as it consists of a number of pieces by different men, whom God raised up at various times perhaps before, but certainly during, and after the Exile."[12] Chapters 40—55, including the 'Servant' poems, are assigned to the Second Isaiah. Chapters 56—66 are held to be by various writers, not excluding the Second Isaiah himself. Concerning the prayer in 63 7—64 12, for instance, Smith says: "Nor is there final reason against attributing it to the same writer"[13] as 40—55. In general, the arguments for a postexilic date and Palestinian background for 56—66 so far prevail with this commentator as to induce him to leave the possibility open for certain portions of these chapters. As with Levy, there is no suggestion of a possible connection between chapters 34f. and the Second Isaiah.[14]

[7] Pp. 30f. [8] Pp. 31f. [9] P. 13. [10] P. 14.

[11] P. 12. Cp. p. 220: "delivered and perhaps written by the author of 40—48." [12] Vol. II, p. 23. [13] P. 488.

[14] Notice, that Causse (*op. cit.*, p. 98n), suggests a connection of 34f. with the *Trito*-Isaiah cycle.

In decided contrast with the writers just mentioned, Professor Torrey comes out flatly for the unity and essential integrity of Second Isaiah (including 34 f.). "Chapters 34—66 of the book of Isaiah," he maintains," (with the exception of 36—39, which have a different origin) form a homogeneous group and are the work of a single hand. The evidence of unity of authorship is manifold and clear. The twenty-seven poems which constitute the group were composed and written down in the order in which we now find them. Their author wrote in Palestine, presumably in Jerusalem, near the end of the fifth century B. C. The people whom he addresses are in their own land, and there is in his words no hint that they, or any portion of them, have ever been anywhere else. The Second Temple has long been in existence."[15] In these striking sentences Torrey sums up his "new view of the prophecy." This view is based on a most searching examination of such criteria as vocabulary, style, special literary features, background, thought, etc. Especially impressive is the argument drawn from the uniformity of themes treated from end to end of chapters 34—66. "Like the warp of a textile" certain motives run through. Whoever will take pains to consider carefully the long list of recurring topics given on pages 58 and 59 of the commentary cannot but realize that here is a phenomenon which is extremely difficult to reconcile with current theories of dual or multiple authorship. Particularly is this true if all the various converging lines of evidence adduced for unity of authorship are simultaneously kept in view.

Torrey's position, with its dating about 400 B. C.,[16] quite evidently conflicts with the mention of Cyrus in 44 28 and 45 1. So far as 45 1 and the succeeding verses are concerned, the point is made that the terms used to describe Cyrus are exactly those employed regularly elsewhere of the 'Servant.' To this evidence must be added the significant fact that לְכוֹרֶשׁ is clearly an intrusion into the text. The meter, which in this section is unmistakably 3/3, is hopelessly broken unless the offending "to Cyrus" be dropped.

[15] P. 53; cp. above, pp. 363 f.

[16] He tentatively connects ch. 57 9 f. with the throwing off of the Persian yoke by Egypt in the year 407 B. C. (pp. 109, 431 f.).

Above and beyond all this is the intrinsic improbability that a poet and seer of the evident caliber of Second Isaiah should have been guilty of such a monstrous breach of good taste as to identify the heathen king Cyrus with Yahweh's Messianic deliverer. As a later explanatory gloss, based on the Chronicler's unhistorical account of the Return and intended to interpret לִמְשִׁיחוֹ, the expression finds its most probable explanation.—As for 44 28, a number of scholars have long recognized that the latter half of the verse is late.[17] The whole verse, in fact, seems to be nothing more nor less than a prosaic interpretative echo of v. 26, introduced for the purpose of preparing the way for the לְכוֹרֶשׁ of the following verse.

Besides the 'Cyrus' interpolation there is one other which the evidence seems to require setting aside. This is the 'Babylon-Chaldea' insertion in the three verses, 43 14, 48 14 and 48 20. A glance into any critical commentary will reveal what devastating havoc this pair of words has raised with both sense and meter in the passages where they occur. Once the words are expunged, order and meaning are convincingly restored.[18] As in the case of 'Cyrus' the ultimate origin of this interpolation is apparently to be sought in the Chronicler's romantic history.

So skilfully have both these interpretative glosses been inserted that none seems hitherto to have suspected their real nature. As a result commentators have during two millennia confined themselves to narrowly fixed channels in tracing the probable background of Second Isaiah. For chapters 40—55 at least an 'exilic' origin has been conceived to be a necessary postulate[19]. Now Torrey, with a minimum of change and that based on the most cogent sort of reasoning, has demonstrated that in all probability no part of 34—66 belongs in the 'exile.' The result is deliverance

[17] So Duhm, Cheyne, *et al.*

[18] For a detailed discussion of these emendations reference should be made to pp. 40ff., 354ff. of the commentary.

[19] Torrey's chapter on "The Exile and the Restoration" in his *Ezra Studies*, pp. 285—335, is important for a true understanding of the whole 'exilic' period and afterwards.

from a position which was rapidly becoming quite untenable. No longer is there any occasion for breaking up Second Isaiah into larger or smaller fragments as evidence accumulates that the 'Cyrus' background is impossible. In other words, one is now under no compulsion to deny unity where unity manifestly exists. Not part but all of Second Isaiah belongs in the period of the restored temple and community. Is it not evident that, unless some such reconstruction as Torrey suggests be accepted, modern scholarship is thrown upon the other horn of the dilemma, viz., the continued dissection of Second Isaiah into more or less minute and unrecognizable fragments?

2. Text.

We have next to inquire what these commentators have accomplished in the way of fixing a correct text for Second Isaiah. Neither Levy nor Smith take up this fundamental problem in any great detail. In the course of their exposition they naturally find occasion to accept, reject or sometimes to suggest certain emendations. Torrey, on the other hand, in addition to elaborate notes on the individual passages, devotes an entire chapter of his introduction to an extremely suggestive treatment of "The Critical Apparatus."[20] Here he contends that "the massoretic recension is generally correct as it stands . . . In nearly every case where the text is manifestly corrupt, the original reading can be restored with certainty or a good measure of probability."[21] Copyists' errors are, however, present in considerable number. These include, (a) wrong word divisions; (b) dittography; (c) haplography; (d) erroneous insertion of the conjunction *waw;* (e) wrong verse divisions; (f) mistaken vocalization, etc., etc. Of material omissions from the text there is no evidence. Except for (a) the 'Cyrus' and 'Babylon-Chaldea' interpolations, and (b) a few corrections by narrow super-patriots, extremely few additions occur.[22] In his exposition of the remarkably ingenious system of alternative read-

[20] Chapter XII, pp. 205—219.
[21] P. 205.
[22] Pp. 206, 119—121.

ings in the Hebrew, especially that device which divides a sentence between two grammatical constructions, Dr. Torrey has made a notable contribution to the textual criticism of the book.[23] The Septuagint he finds inaccurate and corrupt, a broken reed upon which interpreters have leaned heavily to their cost. In the matter of the text, then, it would appear that Torrey is the one who has most significantly enriched recent Second Isaiah criticism.

Perhaps it will be instructive in this connection to compare the treatment of a typical passage by our three interpreters. The poem 44 6—23 will serve excellently as a sample; its Hebrew is so corrupt in several of the opening verses as simply to demand emendation.[24] To begin with v. 6aα: the name יהוה is not only wanting in the Greek but is also metrically superfluous. Its insertion was very likely suggested by its occurrence in the succeeding half-verse. Levy and Smith both retain the troublesome word; Torrey, to the manifest improvement of the rendering, drops it.[25]—In v. 7b, מְשׂוּמִי עַם־עוֹלָם וְאֹתִיּוֹת is absolute nonsense as it stands. Levy renders the first three words: "Since I set down the people of old?" וְאֹתִיּוֹת he leaves for the next line. In the notes he makes mention of the emendation suggested by Oort, Duhm and others, viz., מִי הִשְׁמִיעַ מֵעוֹלָם אֹתִיּוֹת. While timidly refusing to commit himself on this suggestion, he comments: "No explanation of the present text is quite satisfactory, however, and some derangement must be suspected."[26] Smith, accepting the emendation mentioned, translates: "Who from of old made heard things to be?"[27] Torrey independently betters the emendation in that, with a minimum of alteration, he reads: מַשְׁמִיעַ מֵעוֹלָם אֹתִיּוֹת, "announcing from eternity the things to come?"[28]—The second clause of v. 11 is difficult as it stands. Levy and Smith render it as literally as possible, but hardly satisfactorily. Torrey once more comes to the rescue with a tempting division of the consonants

[23] Pp. 206f.

[24] For some obscure reason Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* prints vv. 9–20 as prose. As a matter of fact the passage has all the characteristics of Hebrew poetry, including 3/3 meter throughout.

[25] Pp. 236, 345. [26] P. 172. [27] P. 166. [28] P. 346.

which would read: וְחָרָשָׁיו מְהֻמָּה מְאֹדָם, "they who make them, confusion is their utmost."[29] — V. 12a, חָרַשׁ בַּרְזֶל מַעֲצָד, is reproduced by Smith as, "The worker in iron . . . an axe (?)," with the note: "This line is uncertain."[30] Levy, following learned predecessors (though without acknowledgment), would prefer to delete מַעֲצָד as a gloss to בַּרְזֶל. He would then, disregarding the resulting break in the meter, read חָרַשׁ בַּרְזֶל with the following half-verse, rendering: "The craftsman in iron worketh in the coals."[31] Torrey makes the illuminating suggestion that we change a single consonant, reading מְעַצֵּב for מַעֲצָד, and translating: "The worker in iron cuts it out."[32]

Many other passages might be cited with strikingly similar results.[33] In almost every case it would appear that Torrey proffers the freshest and most promising suggestions looking toward the solution of the numerous textual problems which have exercised Old Testament scholars for years. His work happily combines judicious use of the best results of past study with a surprisingly large number of new but quite convincing proposals. It is hardly needful to emphasize the importance of such investigations. For until a reliable text is established, the further work of translation and interpretation can scarcely be done with any adequate sense of security.

3. Meter and Strophe.

Although discussing the subject of meter incidentally here and there throughout their commentaries, neither Levy nor Smith take up this important and difficult matter in any systematic fashion. Again it is Professor Torrey who alone furnishes a detailed and orderly exposition of the theme. Under the captions "Metric Forms and Details," and "Reconstruction by Meter and Strophe,"[34] he brings forth treasures both new and old. As elsewhere in Hebrew poetry he finds the 3/3 measure to prevail here. Occas-

[29] P. 348. [30] P. 168. [31] P. 174. [32] P. 349.

[33] Cp. 50 4, despaired of by both Levy and Smith, but restored to sense and sanity by Torrey (pp. 391f.).

[34] Chapters IX and X, pp. 151—182.

ionally, as in 40 12, 15, this norm is pleasingly varied by an extra member, resulting in a 3/3/3 verse. The 3/2 measure appears to be a logical expansion of the single 3 beat foot. Accordingly the structural unit in this *lyric* or *dramatic* meter is a combination of two 3/2 lines, corresponding to the two 3 beat lines of the ordinary couplet. Here, also, an artistic variant occurs in that occasional 3/3/2 or 3/2/3 measures are employed. Both standard meters, the 3/3 and the 3/2, may be and often are found in the same poem. The transition from one to the other is apt to accompany significant turns in the development of the thought. Disregard of this fact has often misled scholars into the fatal error of dismembering the skilfully articulated poems of the prophet.[35]

Strophic arrangement is not attempted by Levy. Smith occasionally places the material in set quatrain form, not always with happy results. In the case of 49 1—9a, for example, the resulting stanzas awkwardly break athwart the natural divisions of the thought.[36] Torrey warns in strongest terms against the use of any rigid strophic strait-jacket, with the 'butchery' involved in trying to make the material fit. "The reader will perhaps be surprised," he remarks, "to see how little evidence of any arrangement in stanzas of equal length is to be found in Hebrew poetry."[37] Nevertheless Torrey recognizes that the quatrain, because of the principle of parallelism, becomes naturally "the most common logical division of any Hebrew poem."[38] His protest is against the vicious custom of insisting upon this division willy-nilly.[39]

Admittedly much remains to be learned about both meter and strophe. Yet it would appear that a real advance has been made.

[35] Cp. Smith, pp. 500, 502, who hesitates as to the unity of chapter 65 because of these variations in meter ("whether by the same or another hand," etc.).

[36] See pp. 330ff. In this instance we notice also the disastrous mutilation of an unusually effective poem as a result of the separation of a so-called 'Servant Song.'—Cp. also pp. 336f., where 50 4 f. is rather arbitrarily rearranged in the interests of strophic regularity. On this see Torrey, pp. 391f.

[37] P. 175. [38] P. 178.

[39] Torrey's 'reconstruction' of Tennyson's *Crossing the Bar* is a delicious satire on the misuse of meter as a guide to correct text (pp. 179ff.).

4. Historical Background.

Under the topic *Unity* it has already been indicated that the most probable dating of chapters 34—66 (excluding 36—39) is about 400 B. C. It remains simply to notice that if the arguments adduced by Torrey are valid—as I, for one, believe they are[40]—then thousands of pages of commentary material (including, unfortunately, many fine passages in Smith and Levy) must go into the scrap heap as irrelevant. The long excursuses on Cyrus and such Babylonian institutions as the processional way do not really belong in a volume dealing with Second Isaiah. Instead we must pay considerably more attention to the middle of the Persian period in Palestine. It is becoming increasingly apparent that much material is available, in the Old Testament and beyond it, for charting the thought currents of the times. No longer may we think of this period as a legalistic land of sand and thorns. Second Isaiah had an audience. There must have been in the cosmopolitan Jerusalem of his time those who could understand and appreciate him.[41] His background was emphatically not an era of literary and spiritual decay and of general retrogression, but rather the time of all times when the Hebrew genius came to its finest flower and fullest fruition.

5. Appreciation.

We face finally the question as to what help these recent interpreters of Second Isaiah have given us toward attaining an adequate appreciation of the literary and religious qualities of the seer. Are we not here close to the heart of the whole matter? For unless we arrive somehow at a just estimate of this massive figure of the olden time, his writings can profit our generation but little. It is a sobering thought, as well, that our judgment of the past is a pretty accurate measure of our own mental and spiritual attainment.

[40] Cp. also the favorable reaction of J. A. Montgomery in the *Anglican Theological Review* XI, No. 2 (October, 1928), pp. 165—168; and of G. A. Barton in *Christian Education* XII, No. 1 (October, 1928), pp. 40—45.

[41] See Torrey, pp. VII, 204.

As already suggested, Levy's main contribution to the appreciation of the prophet lies in the significant fact that he teaches us to see through Jewish eyes. It is not quite clear that he would rank Second Isaiah so high as would the other two scholars under consideration. While acknowledging the literary skill of the poet-prophet, he by no means stresses it. His estimate of the religious values of the book likewise seems rather below the actuality. The great culminating idea of these poems, viz., the atoning and reconciling function of sacrificial suffering voluntarily endured, he believes to have passed somewhat below the horizon of recent Jewish thinking.[42] Nor does he appear to consider this an irreparable loss. In his practical restriction of the 'Servant' to a national interpretation[43] there is also, one cannot help feeling, a certain limitation. But when all is said, this scholar has at least helped us to realize more vividly how great has been the influence of Second Isaiah on later writers.

Admittedly Principal Smith's commentary is exceptionally strong in the matter of interpretation and appreciation, both literary and spiritual. Ever since his volumes on Isaiah first appeared they have taken rank as the ideal exposition of the book for teachers and preachers. In them, it is often remarked, we see the critical scholar at his best. All the more, then, does one regret the failure in the new edition to iron out certain wrinkles left in the old. Where a satisfactory text has not yet been achieved there is left a sense of disappointment, not only with the commentary, but with the prophet himself. Working against real appreciation, too, is the author's removal (as in the 'Servant Songs') of fragments of passages from the context of the poems in which they are embedded in order to gather into one chapter a group of related topics. Because of this it becomes impossible to appreciate the literary power of poems as wholes. In many cases[44] we are asked to admire torsos and fragments where we might better view complete units.

[42] P. 109.

[43] Pp. 15f.

[44] See, e. g., pp. 440ff., where the striking poem 56 9—57 21 is broken up into fragments.

Some of the earlier poems, furthermore, fail to appear in their true greatness because of the forced exegesis of certain 'Servant' passages to fit the 'Cyrus' interpolation; there is too much Cyrus in the commentary. Possibly, too, the really splendid interpretations of the 'Servant' have at times almost too much of a New Testament flavor—it is fatally easy to read into a text ideas which are only remotely implicit there. The fact remains, however, that Smith's volumes still stand as classics in the field of spiritual interpretation and appreciation.

Dr. Torrey gives Second Isaiah a supreme place both as poet and seer. "There is good ground," he asserts, "for pronouncing this suite of twenty-seven lyrics the greatest single poetical work of any age."[45] His chapter on "Characteristic Literary Features"[46] throws new light on the literary craftsmanship of the poet. Especially enlightening is the comparison[47] of the structure of the poems with that of a classical musical composition. The poem usually begins with a brief introduction. This is followed by the first theme (a); then comes the second theme (b), contrasted with the first theme. Lastly, we have a finale combining the two. A careful study of the compositions in the light of their basic structure awakens new enthusiasm for this master workman at the poet's trade. Added to this is his free and varied use of such devices as assonance, word-plays, repetition, dramatic dialogue, humor, and boldness in figures of speech.

Perhaps the most striking section of this scholar's appreciative interpretation of Second Isaiah is that which deals with the prophet's attitude toward the Gentiles.[48] The charge of vindictiveness and narrowness sometimes brought against him is amply refuted. Instead we are reminded that the new gospel which the book so insistently repeats is nothing more nor less than "the announcement of salvation for the Gentiles."[49] In this connection the

[45] P. X.
[46] Chapter XI, pp. 183—204.
[47] Pp. 191f.
[48] Pp. 111ff.
[49] P. 113.

Messianic leader is portrayed by the prophet with such originality and power that succeeding ages turn back to it for the essential features of their hope.[50] It is no small merit of Torrey's commentary that he has set in high relief the fact that Second Isaiah has primarily in mind the Messianic age. One rises from the reading of this study of the master poet and prophet amazed and won by the majestic breadth of his sympathy and love. No longer may even a cynical generation question that here are literary and spiritual treasures of the highest quality and value, worthy to be handed down from generation to generation.

IV

It must be evident as the issue of this discussion that these recent interpreters have helped us to a better understanding and truer appreciation of the Second Isaiah. Levy has brought the important Jewish point of view. Principal Smith, while contributing little more that is new, has emphasized once again the unique religious insight of the prophet. Torrey has given us an original and stimulating study with which Biblical scholarship must henceforth seriously concern itself. His creative work on the insistent problems of unity, text, meter and strophe, background, and appreciation challenges attention. It would seem that he has shown us the way to a more coherent and just view of this greatest of all the literary masterpieces of the ancient world.[51]

[50] For the influence of the Messiah of Second Isaiah on the portrait of Jesus in the Gospels and in Acts, see the article by Torrey in the symposium on "Primitive Christianity and Judaism" in Parts I and II of this volume of the JOURNAL, pp. 24—36.

[51] Cp. the review in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages* XLV, No. 1 (Oct. 1928): "Taken as a whole it seems to the writer that here we have an American achievement, literary and historical, rivalling that of Wellhausen" — this with reference to the Torreyan trilogy on Ezra, Second Isaiah and Ezekiel.

DIE FÜNF SINNE IM NEUEN TESTAMENT

VON D. ERNST VON DOBSCHÜTZ, HALLE

Die nachstehende Abhandlung[1], welche die Aufmerksamkeit auf ein bisher wenig beachtetes Problem lenkt, möchte einen Beitrag zur Charakteristik des Urchristentums nach seiner Eigenart geben. Die im Neuen Testament bezeugte Religion hebt sich gerade hier deutlich von aller Philosophie, aber auch der umgebenden Religionswelt des Hellenismus ab. Dabei lassen sich doch vielleicht die verschiedenen Ströme des damaligen Synkretismus in ihrem Einfluß auf das Urchristentum erkennen. Das Neue Testament steht zum Alten, das Urchristentum knüpft an das Judentum an, und dieses ist von den Religionen des Orients ebenso wie von denen der hellenistischen Welt spezifisch unterschieden. Aber man beobachtet doch immer wieder, daß das Judentum so gut wie das Urchristentum nicht ohne Beeinflussung durch die Umwelt seinen Weg hat machen können. Schwierig ist nur, was wir erst neuerdings deutlicher zu erkennen beginnen, daß es mit dem einfachen Gegensatz Judentum und Hellenismus nicht getan ist. In letzerem steckt schon der Synkretismus, der Griechisches und Orientalisches verbindet. Beide sind deutlich unterschieden und doch wesensverwandt. So ist es nicht immer

[1] Sie wurde zuerst vorgetragen in einer religionsgeschichtlichen Vereinigung, dem Halleschen Thiasos. Der regen Aussprache, an der sich die Herren E. Diehl, H. Dörries, O. Eißfeldt, H. Gunkel, G. Karo, O. Kern, H. Schmidt, H. W. Schomerus, Th. Zachariae, Th. Ziehen beteiligten, verdanke ich manche wertvolle Anregung. Das Material aus den Hermetika- und Mandäer-Schriften haben mir die Herren H. Braun und O. Michel beschafft.

leicht, im einzelnen sicher auszumachen, auf welche Quelle eine bestimmte Erscheinung zurückgeht.

Von der Bedeutung der Sinne im Urchristentum wollen wir reden. Spielen überhaupt die Sinne in der Religion eine Rolle? Hat die Religion es nicht mit der Welt des Übersinnlichen zu tun, vor allem das Christentum? Wer von dem Neuen Testament herkommt, dem liegt diese Frage sehr nahe. Der allgemeine Eindruck ist in der Tat, daß hier die ganze Sinnenwelt hinter der reinen Geistigkeit des Gottesgedankens und der entsprechenden Geistigkeit der Gottesverehrung zurücktritt. Anders wird schon denken, wer die Religionsgeschichte kennt, die in ihren niederen Stufen die Bedeutung des Sinnlichen auch für die Religion stark hervortreten läßt. Es läßt sich nur fragen, wie weit dieses Sinnliche im Verlauf der Entwicklung von den Religionen abgestreift worden ist. Wir haben hier einen sehr deutlichen Fall eines vielfach zu beobachtenden Entwicklungsprozesses vor uns, der von sinnlicher Wirklichkeit zu geistiger Bildlichkeit religiöser Worte und Wendungen führt. Gerade diesen Prozeß der Vergeistigung zu studieren, den Übergang aus dem Gegenständlichen in das Bildhafte zu verfolgen, ist für den Religionsforscher von höchstem Interesse. Kommt man mit einem von hieraus geschulten Auge an das Neue Testament heran, so zeigt sich doch, daß der allgemeine Eindruck trügt. Es ist hier mehr von den Sinnen die Rede, als man von vornherein vorauszusetzen geneigt ist. Aber es fragt sich immer, in welchem Sinne diese Wendungen gemeint sind. Haben wir wirklich ein Recht, Beobachtungen aus der allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte in ihren älteren Stufen auf das Urchristentum zu übertragen? Dürfen wir von Nachwirkungen eines Kultrealismus reden? Oder müssen wir statt dessen nicht viel mehr die reine Vergeistigung, den Bildcharakter der meisten hier in Betracht kommenden Äußerungen betonen? Ist es angängig, Einflüsse der Umwelt zu konstatieren? oder hat der Vergleich nur dazu zu dienen, die Besonderheit des Urchristlichen klar herauszustellen? Jedenfalls lohnt sich eine Untersuchung dessen, was das Neue Testament über die Sinne und ihre Bedeutung für Religion und Ethik sagt. Die Periode, in der wir in falscher Übergeistigkeit fast

vergaßen, daß der Mensch neben dem geistigen ein sinnliches Leben führt, von Gott zu beidem bestimmt, und daß auch die Sinne ein Gottesgeschenk sind, für das der Mensch zu danken hat, ist heute doch wohl vorüber. Es gehört zu den wesentlichen Zügen der biblischen Religion, daß sie an jener falschen übergeistigen Einstellung keinen Teil hat. Sie kann nicht verantwortlich dafür gemacht werden, daß Christen teilweise unter dem Einfluß des Denkens griechischer Philosophen sich so einseitig übersinnlich eingestellt haben, daß sie Gott und sein Schöpfungswerk aus den Augen verloren und nur noch „geistlich" lebten und dachten.

I.

Eine Theorie über die fünf Sinne, wie sie die griechische Philosophie aufgestellt hat, und wie sie bei dem jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophen Philo eine große Rolle spielt, fehlt dem Neuen Testament. Schon das ist bezeichnend. Das Urchristentum steht philosophischen Theorien völlig fern. Die Fünfzahl der Sinne, bei Philo so gerne allegorisch verwendet, wird im Neuen Testament nirgends erwähnt, geschweige denn, daß über die Funktion der Sinne irgendwelche Gedanken entwickelt würden. Hinter den Sinnen steht letzlich als Zentralorgan das Herz, nicht der Nûs, und es wird weniger davon gesprochen, was die Sinne dem Herzen zuführen, als davon, daß aus dem Herzen die bösen Gedanken kommen (vgl. unten Nr. IX). Die vorausgesetzten Anschauungen sind völlig unreflektiert. Es ist naive volkstümliche Psychologie, die hier verwendet wird.

Die Fünfzahl der Sinne scheint eine verbreitete, nicht bloß auf die Griechen beschränkte Anschauung zu sein. Wenigstens wird, wie mir Herr Geheimrat Zachariae mitteilt, das Wort für Sinn im Indischen auch als Ideogramm für die Fünf-Zahl gebraucht.

Auffallend häufig ist die Bezugnahme auf die fünf Sinne bei Philo. Er zählt sie auf u. a.: de cherub. 73 (I 188 Cohn-Wendland), de conf. ling. 53, 90 (II 239, 246), regelmäßig in der Reihenfolge: Gesicht, Gehör, Geruch, Geschmack, Gefühl[2]. Er verwendet die

[2] Nur bei Geruch, Geschmack schwankt die Stellung, vergl. de Abr. 236, 238.

Fünfzahl allegorisch, wo immer es geht. So findet er die fünf Sinne dargestellt in der dem Verderben geweihten Pentapolis des Jordantales, von der nur eine Stadt, Zoar, erhalten bleibt Gen. 19: De Abrahamo 147–149, 165 f. (IV 34, 38 C.–W.). Er findet sie Gen. 14 in den fünf Königen, die mit den vier — das sind ihm die Empfindungen (πάθη) Lust, Begierde, Furcht und Betrübnis — streiten, bis Abraham, der eine Weise (= νοῦς), darüber kommt, die Zahl des Streites Neun zur Zahl der Vollkommenheit Zehn erweiternd. Zwei von den fünf Königen fallen in einen Brunnen: Geschmack und Tastsinn reichen in die Tiefen des Körpers, indem sie die Sinneseindrücke den Eingeweiden übermitteln; drei andere Könige fliehen: Gesicht, Gehör, Geruch schweifen gerne umher und suchen sich von dem Körper loszumachen (de congr. erud. gr. 92 f., III 90; de Abr. 236–244, IV 52 ff.). Philo findet die Fünfzahl in den fünf bunten Röcken, die Joseph, der Typus der Äußerlichkeit, seinem Vollbruder Benjamin, dem Sohne Rahels, der Sinnenwahrnehmung, schenkt Gen. 45 22; in der von Joseph angeordneten Abgabe eines Fünftels von allem Ertrag der Ägypter Gen. 47 24 (de migr. Abr. 203 f., II 308). Wenn Jakob nach Ägypten kam, nach Exodus 1 5 LXX mit 75 Seelen, nach Deuteron. 10 21 mit 70 Seelen, so löst sich dieser Widerspruch bei Philo durch die Erkenntnis, daß es sich bei der Differenz von fünf um die fünf Sinne handelt, die Jakob, der noch Ringende, abstoßen muß, um zu dem Überwinder Israel zu werden (de migrat. Abr. 199 ff., 201, II 307); das gleiche schon in den 75 Jahren Abrahams Gen. 12 4 (198 II 307). Philo findet die fünf Sinne in den fünf Töchtern des Salpaad aus dem Stamme Manasse, also von Josephs Art, auf das Äußerliche gerichtet (Num. 26 33, de vita Mosis II 203–205, IV 247; de migr. Abr. 205, II 309). Er findet sie in den fünf Säulen, die an der Front der Stiftshütte stehen, die Außenseite und die Innenseite verbindend Exodus 26 37, (de vita Mosis II 81, IV 219).

Nicht genug mit diesen Pentaden. Philo folgt daneben einer stoischen Doctrin, welche die Seele in zwei Teile zerlegt, eine höhere (τὸ λογικόν), bei Philo dem νοῦς gleichgesetzt, und eine niedere (τὸ ἄλογον). Letzterem werden sieben Seelenkräfte zugeschrieben, das ist die Zeugungskraft (γονή), das Sprachvermögen (φωνή) und

die fünf Sinne (de opif. mundi 117, I 41; leg. alleg. I 11, I 63; de agricult. 30, II 101; de Abr. 29, IV 7). Dies ermöglicht es, auch an Stellen, wo die Siebenzahl vorkommt, die Lehre von den fünf Sinnen anzubringen, so z. B. bei den sieben Töchtern des heidnischen Priesters Jethro von Midian, dessen Schwiegersohn Moses wird (Exodus 2 16; de mutat. nom. 110, III 175). Dieselbe Theorie auch de migr. Abr. 206, II 309: die Sinne gehören zum unvernünftigen Teil der Seele; desgleichen de congr. erud. gr. 26, III 77: Lea der vernünftige Seelenteil, Rahel der unvernünftige. Von dieser Lehre aus begreift sich auch die merkwürdige Theorie von den sieben den Menschen beigegebenen Geistern, welche in dem Testament der zwölf Patriarchen (Ruben c. 2) vorgetragen wird; nur ist hier der Geist des Lebens vorangestellt und deshalb neben dem des Gesichts, des Gehörs, des Geruchs, der Rede, des Geschmacks und des Samens der Tastsinn ausgefallen. Auch bei den Indern findet sich in der Lehre von den zweimal fünf Sinnen, den aufnehmenden und den auswirkenden, etwas Ähnliches: zu letzteren gehören auch *γονή* und *φωνή*. In der späteren indischen Spekulation ist dies in der sogenannten Tatwa-Lehre bis zu weit höheren Zahlen (24 und mehr) entwickelt und verfeinert. Die Mandäer legen ihrem Lichtkönig fünf Kräfte bei, die etwas an die fünf Sinne erinnern: Licht, Wohlduft, liebliche Stimme, Rede des Mundes, Schönheit der Gestalt (R. Ginza I 19, S. 7 Lidzbarski). Eine andere Fünfzahl scheint fast Erweiterung der Trias von Deut. 30 14 (= Röm. 10 8 f): Augen, Mund, Ohren, Herz, Hände (I 152, S. 23, vgl. II 1, 115, S. 45). Sie haben eine Neunzahl von Gliedern bzw. Sinnen: Haupt, Auge, Ohr, Mund, Hand, Herz, Körper, Knie, Fuß (R. Ginza II 2, S. 57).

Dem steht nun das völlige Fehlen einer Theorie sowohl im A.T. wie im N.T. gegenüber. Füllt in Leisegangs Philo-Index der Artikel *αἴσθησις* sieben Spalten, so haben wir *αἴσθησις* bei den LXX 28mal, darunter 22mal im Buche der Sprüche für דַּעַת. Im N.T. steht es nur einmal, Phil. 1 9, neben *ἐπίγνωσις*. *αἰσθητήριον*, bei Philo an acht Stellen (leg. alleg I 104, III 183, 235; quod det. pot. ins. sol. 15, de post. Caini 112, de ebriet. 155, 201, de confus. ling. 20), schreiben LXX Jerem. 4 19; wir lesen es 4. Makk. 2 22

und im N.T. Hebr. 5 14: „Die Erwachsenen, die durch den Gebrauch die Sinneswerkzeuge geübt haben zur Unterscheidung von Gut und Schlecht.“ Also kommen im Neuen Testament *αἴσθησις* und *αἰσθητήριον* je einmal vor. Die Vulgata übersetzt beidemal mit *sensus*. Eine Theorie über die Sinne und ihr Verhältnis zur Vernunft fehlt im Neuen Testament ganz. Ja, wir finden nirgends eine Aufzählung der fünf Sinne. Paulus stellt einmal 1. Kor. 12 17 Gesicht, Gehör und Geruch zusammen; 1. Joh. 1 1 redet von Hören, Sehen und Betasten.

II.

Die sogenannten *niederen* Sinne treten fast ganz zurück. Nicht, als ob sich das von selbst verstünde. In der Religionsgeschichte haben der Geschmack und der Geruch ihre stark ausgeprägte Bedeutung. Beide gehören enge zusammen; das zeigt schon die Sprache: im Oberdeutschen wird Schmecken für Riechen gebraucht, und wo der Norddeutsche sagt: es schmeckt schön, erklärt der Süddeutsche: es ist gut.

Vielfach wird die Gottheit selbst in Form irgendwelcher Speisen genossen oder ihr zu Ehren werden bestimmte Speisen gegessen. Dabei ist selbstverständlich, daß diese heilige Speise wohlschmekkend ist. Manche der Tabu-Regeln, die Unterscheidung von reinen und unreinen, erlaubten und verbotenen Speisen betreffend, mögen auf Geschmacksunterschieden beruhen. So ist bei dem biblischen Verbot, den Wiedehopf zu essen, dessen übler Geruch und Geschmack sicher ein Motiv (s. Baentsch zu Lev. 11 19).

Die Gottheit riecht gerne Gutes; daher dem Opfer lieblicher Duft zukommt. Aber sie riecht auch selbst gut; das Heilige duftet schön. „Mein Atem erfreut sich an des Herren lieblichem Geruch“ heißt es in den Oden Salomos 11 13.

Umgekehrt wird dem Bösen Gestank beigelegt und wohl in Ableitung davon wird die Unwissenheit dem üblen Geruch des Meeres verglichen (Oden Sal. 18 14). Ignatius stellt der wohlduftenden Myrrhe, mit der Christus gesalbt wurde, den üblen Geruch der Irrlehre des Teufels gegenüber (ad Eph. 17 1). Derselbe mahnt im Bilde der durch Salzen vor Fäulnis geschützten Speise, sich vor Irrlehre zu wahren, „da ihr sonst durch den Geruch überführt

werdet" (ad Magn. 10 2). Ganz besonders tritt der Geruch bei den Mandäern hervor: Wohlduft ist die zweite Kraft des Lichtkönigs (R. Ginza I 19, S. 7), Wohlduft entströmt seinem unverwelklichen Kranz (I 1, 25, S. 9). Die Welt des Glanzes und des Lichtes ist zugleich die Welt des Wohlgeruches ohne häßliche Düfte (I 1, 42, S. 10). Der Wohlduft der Könige des Lichts (Engel) überwindet den häßlichen Duft der Götter und den Duft aller Irrlehre (I 1, 61, S. 12). Duft ist gleich sich freuen (R. Ginza I 61, S. 12). Durch den Duft des Lichtsgesandten erhält, wer ihn riecht, Leben (II 3, S. 57 und 59, 20). Der Duft des lebendigen Wassers und des lebendigen Feuers macht den üblen Duft aller Geschöpfe der materiellen Welt (Bäume, Pflanzen, Kräuter usw.) wohlriechend (III 89, S. 92).

Gegenüber diesen religionsgeschichtlichen Tatsachen ist nun die Feststellung wichtig, daß beide Begriffe im Neuen Testament nur ganz selten angetroffen werden und fast durchweg in bildlicher Bedeutung. Das *Schmecken* findet sich im Neuen Testament im eigentlichen Sinne bei der Verwandlung des Wassers zu Wein: der Speisenmeister schmeckt, kostet den Wein (Joh. 2 9) und bei dem Betäubungstrank, den der Gekreuzigte kostet und ablehnt (Mk. 15 23; Mt. 27 34). Diese Stellen haben keine unmittelbare religiöse Beziehung. Wo das Schmecken in religiösem Sinne steht, da ist es bildlich.

Rein bildlich ist der aus Ezech. 3 1 f. in der Joh. Off. 10 9 übernommene Gedanke, daß die in Form einer Rolle von dem Seher verschluckte Offenbarung erst in seinem Munde süß schmeckt wie Honig, um dann im Bauche zu grimmen.

Rein bildlich ist es auch, wenn Paulus den Römern schreibt (15 24), daß er sich an ihnen sättigen wolle. Ignatius (ad Eph. 2 1) spricht in gleichem Sinne von „sich an den Lesern erholen" (ἀναπαύειν) und „erfrischen" (ἀναψύχειν).

Bildlich wird dann auch der Irrtum als ein Gift bezeichnet und von der (trügerischen) Süßigkeit des Todes geredet (Oden Sal. 38 8). Ignatius vergleicht die Irrlehre einem in Honigwein gereichten (μετὰ οἰνομέλιτος) Gifttrank (ad Trall. 6 2).

Sicher bildlich ist die Wendung „den Tod schmecken" (Mk. 9 1

m. Par., Joh. 8 52; Hebr. 2 9). Sie mag in Verbindung gebracht werden mit der bildlich gebrauchten Wendung „den Kelch trinken" im Sinne von „den Tod erleiden", wie wir sie in Jesu Wort an die Zebedaiden (Mt. 20 22; Mk. 10 38), in dem Gethsemane-Gebet (Mt. 26 39; Mk. 14 36; vgl. Joh. 18 11) finden. Wird doch Mt. 27 34 Schmecken gerade vom Kosten eines (Betäubungs)-Trankes gebraucht.

Diese Wendung ihrerseits erinnert wieder an die alttestamentlichen Drohworte von dem Kelch (oder Becher) des Zornes Gottes (Jer. 25 15, 27, 28; Jes. 51 17, 22; Hab. 2 16; vgl. Ez. 23 31 ff.; Ps. 75 9; bitterer Trunk auch Jer. 8 14; Ps. 60 5), die auch im Neuen Testament nachklingen (Off. Joh. 14 10; 16 19; vgl. den Taumelwein Oden Sal. 38 13). Daß hinter dieser bildlichen Wendung ursprünglich ein sakral-gerichtlicher Akt steht, darauf führt vor allem Jer. 49 12, der Gedanke unverschuldeten Trinkens des Kelches. Man mag dabei auch erinnern an das Trinken des Bitterwassers (oder Fluchwassers) durch eine verdächtige Ehefrau (Num. 5 24 f). Vermutlich hat es auch in Alt-Israel oder seiner Umwelt die Strafe des Giftbechers gegeben, dessen Trinken den Tod bringt. Daran mag diese Wendung anknüpfen.[3]

Sicher bildlich ist auch die Anwendung in Hebr. 6 4, 5 „die himmlische Gabe kosten" bzw. „das kräftige Wort Gottes und die Kräfte der zukünftigen Welt kosten": Auch hierhinter mögen konkretere Gedanken von Götterspeise, messianischem Mahl u. dgl. liegen. Aber es ist falsch, einen urchristlichen Kultakt dahinter zu suchen. Mit dem Abendmahlsgenuß hat es wirklich nichts zu tun, sondern ist nur ein Ausdruck für den bewußten Anteil an den christlichen Heilsgütern in Gegensatz zu deren nachmaliger Verscherzung. Bei V. 5 ist dieser bildliche Charakter klar; bei V. 4 haben einzelne Ausleger speziell an das heilige Abendmahl denken wollen. Aber mit welchem Recht nimmt man dasselbe Wort innerhalb desselben Satzes einmal realistisch, das andere Mal bildlich? Es wird bei der himmlischen Gabe an das Heil im allgemeinen

[3] In der Vermutung eines solchen realen Hintergrundes der Wendung γεύεσθαι θανάτου treffe ich mich, wie ich nachträglich feststellte, mit Hans Schmidt.

und bei dem Schmecken an das Bewußt-dessen-teilhaftig-werden zu denken sein. Ebensowenig bezieht sich der 1. Petr. 2 3 aufgenommene Psalmvers 34 9 „Schmecket und sehet, wie freundlich der Herr ist" auf den Abendmahlsgenuß. Bei der geistigen Eigenart der alttestamentlichen Religion ist schon bei dem Psalmvers ein gegenständliches Verständnis, wie es bei der Dionysos-Religion möglich wäre, ausgeschlossen. Allerdings ist die Wortbedeutung „*chrestos*" ganz konkret; es wird nach Lk. 5 39 vom alten Wein gebraucht: er ist mild und süß. Aber das geht schon in der Psalmstelle in die Bedeutung „gütig" über, und so meint es 1. Petr. 2 3 ganz abgesehen davon, daß der Verfasser in *chrestos* vielleicht noch ein Wortspiel mit „*christos*" fand: „daß Christus der Herr ist". Von einem Genießen des Herrn im Sakrament ist hier so wenig die Rede wie Hebr. 6 4 f.

Vom Wohlgeruch im eigentlichen Sinne ist im Neuen Testament 1. Kor. 12 17 (*ὄσφρησις*) die Rede; von dem das ganze Haus erfüllenden Wohlgeruch der Nardensalbe Joh. 12 3; von dem Leichengeruch bei Lazarus Joh. 11 39. Alles andere ist auch hier bildlich. Aus der alttestamentlichen Opfersprache hat das Neue Testament den Gedanken des „*reach nichoach*" (Beruhigungsgeruch) = *ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας* (Wohlgeruchsduft) übernommen, der Opferduft, der der Gottheit willkommen ist. Das wendet Paulus auf die ihm zuteil gewordene Spende der Philipper an (Phil. 4 18); Eph. 5 2 wird es auf das Todesopfer Christi bezogen. Ein etwas anderer Gedanke, von den Weihrauchdüften bei einem Triumphzuge hergenommen, scheint 2. Kor. 2 14 vorzuliegen: „Ein Geruch vom Tode zum Tode, ein Geruch vom Leben zum Leben". Dagegen weiß das Neue Testament nichts von einem sinnlichen Duft des Heiligen, eine Vorstellung, deren Verbreitung *Ernst Lohmeyer* in seiner bekannten Abhandlung „Vom göttlichen Wohlgeruch" (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl. X 9, 1919) an vielen außerchristlichen und spätchristlichen Beispielen dargestellt hat.[4] Hellenistischen Einfluß im Urchristen-

[4] Vgl. übrigens schon H. Weinel, die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im nachapostolischen Zeitalter 1899, 196ff. und Eb. Nestle, ZNW 4, 1903, 272; 7, 1908, 95.

tum zeigt deutlich der in der Petrus-Apokalypse erwähnte Wohlgeruch, der von dem Orte der Seligen ausströmt und den die Jünger bis auf den Verklärungsberg hin riechen — offenbar als ein Beweis für die Wirklichkeit des Geschauten gedacht. Sehr merkwürdig ist auch der von *H. J. Cadbury*, The odor of the spirit at pentecost (Journal of Biblical Literature XLVIII, 237–56, 1928) ausführlich erörterte Zug späterer Pfingstdarstellungen, die neben dem Windesbrausen und den Feuerflammen (also Audition und Vision) auch den Wohlgeruch geltend machen. Aber gerade daß dies in der neutestamentlichen Pfingsterzählung fehlt, ist bemerkenswert.

III.

Auf einer anderen Fläche liegt, was vom *Tastsinn* zu sagen ist.

Auch hierbei gibt es Lust- und Unlustgefühle, wie Philo ausdrücklich betont, ad Abr. 239, IV 52: man fühlt den Unterschied von weich und hart, rauh und glatt, warm und kalt. Diese Seite fehlt im Neuen Testament ganz.

Vielleicht darf man es hierunter stellen, daß bei der bekannten Gotteserscheinung des Elias (1. Kön. 19 11 ff.) Gottes Nahen in dem leisen, sanften Säuseln (im Gegensatz zu Sturmwind, Erdbeben und Feuer) gespürt wird, während umgekehrt Eliphas von Theman (bei Hiob 4 15) dem vorüberstreichenden Lufthauch der Gotteserscheinung die Wirkung des Schreckens beilegt. Bei den neutestamentlichen Gotteserscheinungen findet sich nichts Derartiges. Es ist doch etwas anderes, wenn nach Joh. 3 8 die Tatsächlichkeit des dem Winde verglichenen Geistes am Hören seiner Stimme, d. h. des Windessausens, nicht aber am Fühlen seines Wehens festgestellt wird. So scheint auch das Windesbrausen zu Pfingsten mehr als akustische Erscheinung denn als Gefühlswahrnehmung verstanden zu sein.

Das Tasten kann ein Ersatz für Sehen sein: Der blinde Simson tastet nach den Säulen der Halle (Ri. 16 26). Von dem erblindeten Paulus wird gesagt, daß er an der Hand geführt werden mußte (χειραγωγεῖν Act. 9 8; 22 11). Von dem durch Paulus mit dem Fluch der Blindheit belegten Zauberer Elymas heißt es, daß er nach Leuten suchte, die ihn führten (Act. 13 11).

Meist aber ist Tasten, Fühlen eine Steigerung über das Sehen hinaus. Es ist das stärkste Mittel, sich von der realen Existenz eines Dinges zu überzeugen. In diesem Sinne hat auch Aristoteles gegenüber Demokrits Lehre von dem Trügerischen aller Sinneswahrnehmungen die besondere Zuverlässigkeit des Tastsinnes hervorgehoben. In der Tat wird jeder Mensch überzeugt sein, daß, mögen auch Ohr und Auge ihn täuschen können, die handgreifliche Feststellung von dem Dasein eines Gegenstandes nicht trügt. Was ich fühle, ist mir näher, als was ich höre und sehe. Die harte Wirklichkeit drängt sich überzeugend auf, wenn wir uns an ihr stoßen. Das Feuer ist kein Schein, wenn man sich daran verbrennt! Es gehört schon ein großes Maß dogmatischer Eigenwilligkeit in abstraktem Denken dazu, diesen unmittelbaren Eindrücken gegenüber die Richtigkeit der Sinneswahrnehmung zu bezweifeln. In diesem Sinne einer Übersteigerung heißt es bei Hermes Trismegistos (V 23, 42) Gott erkennen, sehen und mit den Händen selbst ergreifen *νόησιν λαβεῖν, ἰδεῖν καὶ λαβέσθαι αὐταῖς ταῖς χερσίν*. Das ist hier bildlich gemeint, denn es handelt sich um die mit der Vernunft zu vollziehende Erkenntnis Gottes, des unsichtbar Sichtbaren, aus seinen Werken (vgl. Röm. 1 20).

Im Neuen Testament kommt das Tasten unter diesem Gesichtspunkt der sicheren Überführung von der Wirklichkeit in doppelter Hinsicht vor: zunächst bei den Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen. Nach Lk. 24 38 f. überzeugen sich die erschreckten Jünger, die da meinten, einen Geist zu schauen, durch Betasten von Händen und Füßen des Herrn davon, daß er kein Gespenst ist, denn dies hat nicht Fleisch und Bein. Dasselbe noch schärfer ausgedrückt in dem vielleicht aus dem Hebräerevangelium stammenden Fragment bei Ignatius (ad Smyrn. 3 2 *λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον*). Bei Joh. 20 20, 25 ff. wiederholt sich dasselbe nur mit verschärfter Betonung. Es gilt die Identität des Auferstandenen mit dem Gekreuzigten festzustellen. Thomas will nicht glauben, bis daß er die Nägelmale in seinen Händen gesehen und seinen Finger in die Nägelmale und seine Hand in seine Seitenwunde gelegt hat. Und so geschieht es: als der Auferstandene nach 8 Tagen wieder erscheint, heißt er

Thomas, seinen Finger hergeben und die Hände „sehen", seine Hand hergeben und sie in die Seitenwunde legen. Diese handgreifliche Feststellung der Identität gibt den Beweis, daß der Herr wirklich auferstanden ist (ὄντως ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος Lk. 24 34). Man kann auch sagen, sie bietet die Wiederlegung des Doketismus, vgl. Ignatius ad Trall. 10; ad Smyrn. 2; 4, 2).

Scheinbar in Gegensatz hierzu steht das berühmte „Noli me tangere" (Joh. 20 17). Es gehört zu der Eigenart des 4. Evangeliums, daß es sich oft selbst widerspricht, verbessert, aufhebt; (z. B. 4 2; 7 8; 8 15). Wir werden noch sehen, wie sich der ganz auf das Schauen gerichteten Tendenz das „Selig sind, die nicht sehen und doch glauben" (20 29) entgegen stellt. So tritt in diesem μή μου ἅπτου ein Zug des Übersinnlichen gerade an der Stelle hervor, wo scheinbar alles auf die sinnliche Feststellung durch Betasten eingestellt sein sollte. Gerade dies dürfte ein geschichtlich echtes Moment sein; ging doch die Volksvorstellung und mit ihr die Tendenz der Gemeindeüberlieferung gerade auf das kraß Sinnliche. Und daher kann man in jedem un- bzw. übersinnlichen Zug einen Nachklang von wirklich Erlebtem, Unbeschreiblichem erkennen.

Zum andern kommt das Tasten als Mittel der Überzeugung von Wirklichkeit auch in Bezug auf die gesamte Lebenserscheinung Jesu in Betracht. Wieder in Gegensatz zum Doketismus steht bei Johannes das Streben, das irdisch Menschliche an Jesus eindrücklich offenbar zu machen. Darum heißt es nicht nur (Ev. 1 14): „Das Wort ward Fleisch, und wir sahen seine Herrlichkeit", sondern (1. Joh. 1 1): „Das da von Anfang war, das wir gehört haben, das wir gesehen haben mit unsern Augen, das wir geschaut haben und unsere Hände betastet haben, vom Wort des Lebens . . ." Die Gnosis gab um des Gedankens des vom Himmel herabgestiegenen Gottwesens willen die reale Menschheit des Soter preis.[5] Das gnostische Evangelium der Johannes-Akten berichtet, daß

[5] Wie die Gnosis, so haben auch die Mandäer es nur mit übersinnlichen Erscheinungen göttlicher Wesen, eines himmlischen Erlösers, Boten aus der Lichtwelt, zu tun, Gedankengebilden eines mythologischen Denkens, denen die konkrete geschichtlich-menschliche Wirklichkeit fehlt. Daher fehlt auch die Betonung des Tastens.

Jesus keine Fußspuren auf der Erde hinterließ und daß, wenn man ihn habe anfassen wollen, man in Luft griff. Dem gegenüber betont das kirchliche Christentum die volle menschliche Wirksamkeit dessen, der uns Gott offenbart. Der fleischgewordene Logos ist als solcher auch dem Tastsinn zugänglich. So werden wir hier vor das höchste Mysterium des Christentums gestellt und in das grundlegende Geheimnis der Menschwerdung Gottes geführt.

Aber der Tastsinn hat noch eine weitere Bedeutung. Als Ergreifen stellt er das letzte Ziel der Gottgewinnung dar. Das kommt in gewissem Sinne zum Ausdruck, wenn im Neuplatonismus als die höchste Stufe des Aufstiegs das Ergreifen des reinen Seins, die ἐπαφή, erscheint, die noch über die mystische Gottesschau geht. Das ist philosophisch abstrakt. Anders bei Paulus, wenn er (Phil. 3 12) im Bilde des Wettlaufs (oder der Jagd?) sagt: „Nicht, daß ich's schon ergriffen hätte oder schon vollkommen sei, ich jage ihm aber nach, ob ich's auch ergreifen möchte, nachdem ich von Christo Jesu ergriffen bin.“ Man mag nach 1. Tim. 6 12 als Objekt zu ergreifen „das ewige Leben“ ergänzen oder an das Ziel der christlichen Vollkommenheit denken — oder etwa an Gott selbst, gleichviel, in jedem Falle ist es ein Bild, so gut wie die Bilder von Wettlauf und Ringkampf. Bildlich ist ja auch die andere Seite, das Ergriffensein von Jesus Christus. Das läßt an die Bekehrungsgeschichte denken, aber in dieser ist nach keinem der Berichte davon die Rede, daß der Herr die Hand an Paulus gelegt habe. Als Bild aber eignet sich dieser Zug gut zum Ausdruck davon, daß Paulus sich seit seiner Bekehrung als Sklave Jesu Christi fühlt. Man kann ihn auch als Kriegsgefangenen denken, an den der Überwinder seine Hand gelegt hat. Das alles ist bildlich.

Bildlich ist es endlich auch, wenn Ignatius für die erstrebte Seligkeit so gerne den Ausdruck „Gott erlangen“ (θεοῦ ἐπιτυχεῖν) gebraucht (ad Magn. 14; Trall. 12 2; 13; Röm. 1 2; 2 1; 4 1; 9 23; Smyrn. 11 1; Polyc. 2 3; 7 1; vgl. Magn. 1 3; Smyrn. 9 2; mit Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Röm. 5 3; λιμένος ἐπιτυχεῖν Smyrn. 11 3; absolut Philad. 5 1; daneben θεοῦ γέμειν Magn. 14).

IV.

Das ist alles, was von den sogenannten niederen Sinnen im Neuen Testament zu sagen ist, denen nach Philo (de Abr. 149, IV 34) etwas Tierisches und Sklavisches anhaftet.

Weit überwiegend sind die höheren beiden Sinne, das *Hören* und das *Sehen*. Sie kommen in Betracht als die eigentlichen Aufnahmeorgane für die göttliche Offenbarung.

Sehr häufig finden wir beide verbunden, Sehen und Hören: Joh. 3 32; Act. 2 33; 4 20; Apoc. 5 11; 6 1; 8 13; 1. Joh. 1 2; umgekehrt Hören und Sehen 1. Joh. 1 1,[6] dann besonders im Parallelismus membrorum. So schon vom Alten Testament her: Daß Moses die volle Offenbarung Gottes erhalten hat, kleidet Num. 12 8 in die Worte: „Von Mund zu Mund rede ich zu ihnen und er siehet den Herrn in eigener Gestalt.“ In der berühmten Verstockungsdrohung aus Jes. 6 9 f. (Deut. 29 3 f.), bei Mt. 13 13 f f.; Mk. 4 12, Joh. 12 39 f.; Act. 28 26 f f. heißt es: „Mit sehenden Augen nicht sehen und mit hörenden Ohren nicht hören, denn dieses Volkes Herz ist verstockt und ihre Ohren hören übel und ihre Augen schlummern, auf daß sie nicht dermaleinst mit den Augen sehen und mit den Ohren hören und mit dem Herzen verstehen und sich bekehren, daß ich ihnen hülfe.“[7] Nicht minder in der Seligpreisung (Matth. 13 16; Lk. 10 23 f.): „Selig sind die Augen, die sehen, das ihr sehet (und die Ohren, die hören, das ihr höret), denn ich sage euch, viele Propheten und Könige wollten sehen, das ihr sehet, und habens nicht gesehen, und hören, das ihr höret, und habens nicht gehört.“ Will Johannes das Vorhandensein einer Gotteserkenntnis bei den Juden leugnen, so sagt er: „Ihr habt weder seine Stimme gehört, noch seine Gestalt gesehen“ (Joh. 5 37). Soll das alle Wahrnehmungen und alles Denken Übersteigende des zukünftigen Heils geschildert werden, so sagt Paulus mit einem apokryphen Wort (1. Kor. 2 9): „Was kein Auge gesehen hat und

[6] Das Gleiche im Hermes Trismegistos: Sehen und Hören I, 6 (3,16); X 24 (83,12); X 6 (70,10f).

Hören und Sehen I, 1 (1,9); VII, 3 (55,16f.).

[7] Ähnliches bei den Mandäern (R. Ginza I, 161 S. 24).

kein Ohr gehört hat und in keines Menschen Herz gekommen ist, das Gott bereitet hat denen, die ihn lieben"[8].

Die beiden letztgenannten Stellen zeigen, daß in dieser Psychologie noch über den Sinnen als letztes entscheidendes Organ sowohl für die Aufnahme der Eindrücke, wie die dadurch bedingte Willensentscheidung das Herz gilt. Wir kommen darauf noch bei der Besprechung der ethischen Seite zurück (s. u. Nr. IX).

In der Religion der Griechen kann man zwei getrennte Gebiete unterscheiden. Die homerischen Götter offenbaren sich den Menschen, indem sie ihnen in irgendwelcher Menschengestalt sichtbar werden. Hier ist die sinnliche Wahrnehmung des Gesichts die unerläßliche Voraussetzung für die Mitteilung in Gesprächsform. Daneben steht das Orakelwesen, wo alles auf das Wort des Priesters oder der Priesterin ankommt, dem freilich sinnliche Wahrnehmungen wie das Rauschen der Eichenblätter zu Dodona oder die aufsteigenden Dämpfe zu Delphi zur Anknüpfung dienen. Minos holt das Orakel aus einer Höhle. Die Höhlenkulte Kretas machen wahrscheinlich, daß diese Vorstellung in die alte Zeit zurückreicht. Zeus offenbart sich in Blitz und Donner. Es liegt am Menschen, ob er mehr auf die Gesichts- oder Gehörerscheinungen achtet. Bei den Römern steckt der Vates ein Gesichtsfeld am Himmel (*Templum*) ab, um hierin an dem Vogelflug den Willen der Gottheit abzulesen. Bei den Etruskern geschieht zu dem gleichen Zweck die Eingeweideschau durch den Haruspex. Daneben aber hat man unter griechischem Einfluß in Rom die sibyllinischen Bücher mit ihren Orakelsprüchen.

[8] Ein ähnlicher Parallelismus Oden Sal. 15,3f.: „Durch ihn habe ich Augen bekommen und seinen heiligen Tag erblickt; Ohren sind mir geworden und ich habe seine Wahrheit gehört", vgl. 16,10 „denn das Auge sieht seine Werke und das Ohr hört seine Gedanken". In merkwürdigem Wechsel erscheinen hier die Mahnungen „Öffnet eure Ohren" (9,1) und „Öffnet eure Augen" (13,1). In der Manda stehen sich der Lichtglanz und der Ruf gegenüber, eine fast hypostatische Form für die Heilsbotschaft (Ruf des Lebens III, 109 S. 120; III, 117 S. 130; VIII, 220 S. 221), der aber auch Rufe der Widersacher, das ist der Sterngeister, gegenüber stehen (III, 88 S. 90; III, 122 S. 138). Lichtglanz und Ruf als Paar III, 116 S. 130; V, 201 S. 182.

In der Hermetik wechseln Belehrungen und Schauungen, der Wunsch zu hören I 3 (2,5); I 16 (8,16); XIII 16 (124,3) und der zu sehen, die Mahnung: „Höre, o Kind" XI 1 (85,9) und die andere: „Schau" (θέασαι) oder „sieh" (ἰδέ) XI 6 (88,17); XI 7 (89,3. 14), wobei freilich das „siehe" (ὅρα) oft die abgeschwächte Bedeutung logischer Einsicht hat XII 12 (106,9); 20 (111,6); XIII (120,9. 14).

Im Alten Testament ist besonders bemerkenswert, wie sich in den ekstatischen Erlebnissen der Propheten Hören und Sehen miteinander verbinden[9]. Die alten Propheten der Samuelzeit heißen Seher (רֹאֶה), auch wenn man sich bei ihnen ein (Orakel-) Wort Jahve's holt; von den späteren Propheten aber gilt, daß bei ihnen das Hören überwiegt. Sie sind Träger von Gottes-Sprüchen, „Das Wort Jahve's geschah zu dem Propheten". Dennoch bleibt das Schauen in Kraft.

Jesaja führt seine Predigt ein „Dies ist das Gesicht Jesajas", auch wenn es mit einem „Hört, ihr Himmel, und Erde, nimm zu Ohren, denn der Herr redet", einsetzt, vgl. 2 1: „Dies ist es, das Jesaja sah von Juda und Jerusalem", worauf ein Weissagungswort, kein Gesicht folgt.

Die grandiose Berufungsvision des Jesaja (c. 6) läuft aus in den Sendungsbefehl an den Propheten. Und ebenso steht es bei dem Gesicht des Propheten Micha ben Jimla (1. Kön. 22 19), dem des Amos (9 1) und dem Thronwagengesicht des Ezechiel: Hier schließt sich der Predigtbefehl an den Propheten unmittelbar an (c. 1 und 2).

Eine ähnliche Verbindung weisen auch die Apokalypsen auf. Sie bestehen aus Gesichten, aber das Wesentliche daran sind doch die Worte, die der Seher hört, um sie weiter zu geben; mindestens verlangt das Gesicht in der Regel eine Deutung, die der Apokalyptiker von dem *angelus interpres* erhält (vgl. Daniel 7 1 ff., 16 ff.; 8 1 ff., 13 ff.; syr. Baruch 39; 55—74; IV. Esra 4. 5 31; 10 29 (13 25); Joh. Apoc. 7 13 ff.; 17 7 ff.). Mit dem Befehl: „Was du siehst, schreibe in ein Buch" (Apoc. 1 11) wechselt der Befehl,

[9] Vgl. hierzu H. Gunkel in seiner Einleitung zu Hans Schmidt: Die großen Propheten (Die Schriften des Alten Testaments, ausgelegt, Göttingen[2] 1923).

bestimmte Worte aufzuschreiben (14 13; 19 9; 21 5, vgl. auch Hermas Vis. II 4 3). Ein Höhepunkt ist es, wenn dem Seher geboten wird, Dinge, die er gehört hat, zu versiegeln und nicht aufzuschreiben (Joh. Off. 10 4). Man kann oft einen fast rhythmischen Wechsel von „und ich sah" und „und ich hörte" beobachten.

Auch bei den visionären Erlebnissen Jesu und seiner Jünger ist die gleiche Verbindung vorhanden. Bei der Taufe sieht Jesus den Himmel geöffnet und den Geist wie eine Taube herniederkommen und hört eine Stimme „Du bist mein geliebter Sohn, an welchem ich Wohlgefallen fand"[10]. Bei der Verklärung sehen die Jünger Jesus in seiner Herrlichkeit mit Moses und Elias, aber das Entscheidende ist doch die Himmelsstimme: „Dieser ist mein geliebter Sohn, auf ihn sollt ihr hören" (Mk. 9 2—8 m. Par.). Auch bei der Bekehrung des Paulus handelt es sich in erster Linie um ein Gesicht, die himmlische Lichterscheinung. Aber diese gewinnt doch erst Bedeutung durch die Stimme, in der sich Jesus seinem Verfolger zu erkennen gibt, und den Auftrag, der sich daran anschließt (Act. 9 1—9; 22 4—11; 26 10—18). Merkwürdig ist hierbei, wie der Charakter der Vision als eines objektiven Geschehens, das doch nur für Paulus Bedeutung hat, dadurch zum Ausdruck gebracht wird, daß es von seinen Gefährten nach der einen Fassung heißt: „Die Männer aber, die seine Gefährten waren, standen und waren erstarrt, denn sie hörten eine Stimme und sahen niemand" (9 7), nach der anderen aber: „Die aber mit mir waren, sahen das Licht und erschraken, die Stimme aber des, der mit mir redete, hörten sie nicht" (22 9).

Auch bei der Entrückung in den dritten Himmel bezw. in das Paradies handelt es sich, wie Paulus ausdrücklich sagt, um ein

[10] Die Überlieferung schwankt, indem bald das eine, bald das andere aus der subjektiven Sinneswahrnehmung in objektives Geschehen umgesetzt wird. Mk. 1 10 „er sah"; 11 „und eine Stimme (geschah) vom Himmel", Lk. 3 22, „Die Himmel öffneten sich und der Geist kam herab und eine Stimme geschah", Mt. 3 16f. „und siehe, die Himmel öffneten sich, und er sah Gottes Geist herabkommen, und siehe, eine Stimme (geschah) aus dem Himmel, die sagte ....".

Gesicht; aber das Wichtigste daran scheinen ihm doch die unausgesprochenen Worte, die kein Mensch sagen kann, welche er dabei hörte (2. Kor. 12 1–4). Es ist merkwürdig, daß bei dem oben erwähnten apokalyptischen Wort „Was kein Auge gesehen und kein Ohr gehört hat usw." in der alttestamentlichen Propheten-Vorlage (Jes. 64 4) das Vernehmen mit dem Ohr voransteht, das Sehen mit dem Auge folgt, während Paulus (1. Kor. 2 9) umgekehrt sagt: „Was kein Auge gesehen und kein Ohr gehört hat". Paulus schöpft hier eben nicht aus den Propheten, sondern offenbar aus einer Apokalypse (Apokryphon Eliae?)[11].

V.

Kann man nun sagen, daß das eine vor dem anderen den Vorrang habe? im allgemeinen oder bei einzelnen Autoren?

Es ist allgemein menschlich, daß wir dem Auge größere Bedeutung beilegen als dem Ohr. Wenn wir einem Menschen begegnen, so sehen wir ihm ins Auge, merken uns dessen Farbe und Art, während wir dem Ohr nur bei ganz besonders auffallender Bildung Beachtung schenken. Von hier aus erklärt sich, daß vom Auge im allgemeinen weit mehr die Rede ist als vom Ohr. Im Alten Testament ist das Verhältnis etwa 4 : 2, im Neuen Testament sogar 5 : 2 oder 6 : 2. Dabei ist noch in Rechnung zu stellen, daß die plastische Sprechweise der Semiten für das einfache Hören die Umschreibung gebraucht: „es ward gehört in den Ohren von" oder „es kam zu Ohren (geschah in den Ohren)". Wir haben im Neuen Testament die Wendung „Wer Ohren hat zu hören, der höre" nicht weniger als 15 mal (Mk. 4 9, 23; Mt. 11 15; 13 9, 43; Lk. 8 8; 14 35; Apoc. 2 7, 11, 17, 29; 3 6, 13, 22; 13 9). Dem stehen verhältnismäßig wenige derartig bildliche Wendungen mit Auge gegenüber, z. B. „ein böses Auge haben" (scheel sehen) für neidisch sein, Mt. 20 15. Auch hier kann man statt „ich sah" sagen „meine Augen sahen" (Lk. 2 30), „in unseren Augen" statt „nach unserer Meinung" (Mt. 21 42; Mk. 12 4 = Ps. 118 23); vgl. „die Augen aufheben" (Mt. 17 8; Lk. 6 20, 16 23, 18 13; Joh. 4 35, 6 5, 11 41, 17 1), um so bemerkenswerter ist obige Statistik. Worte wie das

[11] O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel. 1929, S. 35f.

„vom Splitter im Auge des anderen" und „dem Balken im eigenen Auge" (Mt. 7 3 ff; Lk. 6 41 ff.) oder das andere „Das Auge ist das Licht des Leibes" usw. (Mt. 6 22; Lk. 11 34) zeigen, wie sehr sich der menschlichen Betrachtung das Auge als Objekt aufdrängt. Daher spielen die Blinden im Leben wie im Denken der Menschen eine größere Rolle als die Tauben, vgl. die Sprüche von den blinden Blindenleitern Lk. 6 39; Mt. 15 14, 23 16, 24 (Röm. 2 19). Zwar gehört zu den Zeichen der messianischen Zeit beides, daß „die Blinden sehen und die Tauben hören" Mt. 11 5; Lk. 7 22 vgl.Mt. 15 30 f. — Lk. 4 18 wird im Anschluß an Jes. 61 1 nur das Wiedersehend-Werden der Blinden hervorgehoben —. Tatsächlich berichten die Evangelien zwei Heilungen eines Taubstummen (Mk. 7 32 ff. — Mt. 12 22 ff.; Lk. 11 14 ff.)[12] gegenüber 3—4 Heilungen von Blinden (Mk. 8 22 ff. — Mk. 10 46 ff.; Mt. 20 30 ff.; Lk. 18 35 ff. — Mt. 9 27 ff.; Joh. 9 1 ff.). Dazu die Aufzählung von geheilten Kranken mit Blinden, ohne daß Taube genannt wären, Lk. 14 13 u. Joh. 5 3 (Apoc. 3 17). Beachtung verdient auch, daß wir für das Sehen verschiedene Wörter finden: βλέπειν, ὁρᾶν, θεᾶσθαι, θεωρεῖν, wozu man noch κατανοεῖν, καταμανθάνειν rechnen kann; für Hören steht eigentlich immer nur das eine ἀκούειν.

Klar ist, daß die Griechen dem Sehen den Vorrang geben, wie das unwillkürlich in der Wendung bei Joh. 12 21 erscheint, wo die zum Fest in Jerusalem anwesenden Griechen an Philippus mit der Bitte herantreten „Herr, wir wollten Jesum gerne sehen". Das Gesicht erscheint als der vornehmste, als der führende der fünf Sinne. So nennt ihn auch Philo, der Jude, seinen griechischen Autoritäten folgend, den besten (ἀρίστη) der Sinne (de opif. mundi 53, 120 I 17, 42 C—W), den am meisten führenden (ἡγεμονικωτάτη de opif. mundi 147, I 51, de spec. leg. III 195, V 204; ἡγεμονίς de Abr. 164, IV 37), den schnellsten (ὠκυδρομωτάτη de sacrif. Abeli et Caini 78 I 234) den wahrsten (ἀληθεστάτη de Abr. 60, IV 15), gerade im Vergleich zu dem als unglaubwürdig und unsicher (ἄπιστος καὶ ἀβέβαιος) bezeichneten Gehör. Er ist unter allen Sinnen der schönste (καλλιστεύει de Abr. 57, IV 14).

[12] Das blind und taub bei Matthäus stammt nach Ausweis des Lukas nicht aus der Quelle Q, sondern ist verstärkender Zusatz des Evangelisten.

Das Auge ist unter den Sinnen, was das Licht in der Welt, der Verstand (*νοῦς*) in der Seele ist, das Führende (de opif. mundi 53, I 17; quod deus sit immut. 45, II 66). Der Gesichtssinn ist das größte Gut, der Seele nächstverwandt (de spec. leg. III 192, V 204). Nur dem Gesicht hat Gott das Licht zugeteilt, nur auf das Auge gehen Weisheit und Philosophie zurück (de Abr. 156, 164, IV 36, 37). In den griechischen Mysterien handelt es sich wesentlich um ein Schauen. Das *δρώμενον* ist eine Vorführung; die Mysten sind, soweit sie nicht aktiv daran beteiligt werden, Zuschauer. So schaut hier der Mensch die Gottheit.

Freilich scheint dieser Vorrang des Sehens auch in der orientalischen Gnosis zu bestehen. In den gnostisierenden Traktaten des Hermes Trismegistos läuft alles auf die Gottesschau hinaus (*θέα*). Hier freilich nicht in dem realen Sinne eines *δρώμενον* wie bei den Mysterien, sondern als Wahrnehmung mit der Vernunft (*νόησις*) gedacht. Von *θέα* ist in diesem Sinne die Rede I 1; I 6; I 27 (16,3) X 4,5 (69,8ff.). Allerdings verbindet sich auch hier damit eine heilige Rede. Das Schauen ist vielfach als ein Geistiges gedacht (*νοῖ θεωρεῖν = νοεῖν*). Wir haben hier die Eph. 1 18 wiederkehrende Wendung von den Augen des Herzens (*οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας* IV 11 (40 10 f f.) VII 1 (54 6 f.), bzw. *ὁ τοῦ νοῦ ὀφθαλμός* X 4 (69 10)[13].

Bezeichnend für die hellenistische Gnosis ist der Gedanke der Schönheit Gottes (Oden Sal. 15 7, 16 7, 18, 18 19, 29 3).

Wenn der Sänger der Oden Salomos (11 13) dankbar bekennt, „meine Augen hat er erleuchtet", so dürfte das bildlich gemeint sein, wie die Erleuchtung der Herzen, von der Paulus (2. Kor. 4 6) redet; (vgl. auch Eph. 1 18; 2. Tim. 1 10; Hebr. 6 4; 10 32). Später bezeichnet „Erleuchtung" (*φωτισμός*) direkt die Taufe und hierbei ist bemerkenswert die Steigerung: die Katechumenen sind zunächst Hörer (*ἀκροώμενοι*) und rücken dann zu Erleuchteten (*φωτιζόμενοι, νεοφώτιστοι*) auf. In der Religion der Mandäer ist alles Licht und Glanz. Darum steht immer das Auge bezw. das Sehen voran (I, 152 S. 23; I, 161 S. 24; I, 97 S. 42[14]; II, 1, 115 S. 45).

[13] Vom *ὄμμα τῆς ψυχῆς* redet Nikomachos, Arithmet. I, 3,7.

[14] In der A-Fassung (I 167 S. 24) steht zwar das Ohr an erster Stelle

Anders steht es in der Religion des Alten Testamentes. Es hängt mit der Geistigkeit des Gottesgedankens in dieser Religion und zugleich mit ihrer Sittlichkeit zusammen, daß hier das Hören auf Kosten des Sehens stärker hervortritt. Zwar erscheint in den alten volkstümlichen Erzählungen Gott noch in Menschengestalt (Gen. 18), aber auf dem Höhepunkt der israelitischen Religion herrscht durchaus die Vorstellung, daß der Mensch Gott nicht sehen kann; es wäre ihm der Tod. Exod. 19 21; Ri. 6 22; 13 22; Jes. 6 5. Selbst Moses kann den Herrn nur vom Rücken sehen (Exod. 33 23), und in den Gottesvisionen des Elias und Eliphas 1. Kön. 19 11 ff. und Hiob 4 15 wird das Vorüberziehen des Herrn nur wie ein Luftwehen gespürt. Nur bildlich kann es gemeint sein, wenn Hiob nach Gottes Ansprache an ihn (42 5) bekennt: „Nur von Hörensagen hatte ich früher von dir gehört, jetzt aber hat mein Auge dich gesehen", — ein Wort, in dem die höhere Schätzung des Gesichtssinnes gegenüber dem Gehör sehr klar zum Ausdruck kommt, um so merkwürdiger, als nur eine Gottesrede vorangeht, ohne daß die Gotteserscheinung beschrieben wäre. Dagegen offenbart sich Gott schon bei den Patriarchen, indem er zu ihnen redet. Besonders deutlich ist diese Gottesstimme bei Samuel, 1 Sam. 3. Immer wieder fordern die Propheten auf „Höret das Wort des Herrn", und darin liegt zugleich die Forderung, darauf zu hören, d. h. es im Glauben anzunehmen und in willigem Gehorsam sich danach zu richten (vgl. unten Nr. VII). Besonders bezeichnend ist, daß die Propheten die Forderung einer Beschneidung der Ohren aufstellen können, was natürlich bildlich zu verstehen ist und die Bereitwilligkeit, zu hören und gehorchen, meint. Die Religion Israels ist eben darin von allen anderen Religionen des Ostens und Westens deutlich unterschieden, daß sie zugleich Religion des Gedankens und Religion des Willens ist.[15]

Dem entsprechend herrscht auch im Neuen Testament die

aber dafür ist das Auge durch doppelte Betonung stärker betont; in der B-Fassung (II 1, 97, S. 42) steht das Auge voran.

[15] Wie nahe beides beieinander liegt, wie das Eine in das Andere übergeht zeigen deutlich die Oden Salomos, wo wir Gedanke und Wille oft in synonymem Parallelismus antreffen (9,2f., 23,5).

Vorstellung des Wortes und damit des Hörens vor. Der Begriff θέα fehlt ganz, ὅρασις ist selten (Act. 2 17; Apoc. 4 3; 9 17), ὅραμα (Mt. 17 9; Act. 7 31; 9 10; 10 3, 17, 19; 11 5; 12 9; 16 9 f.; 18 9 = 10 mal), ὀπτασία (Lk. 1 22, 24 23; Act. 26 19; 2. Kor. 12 1)— also alle verschwindend selten, abgesehen von dem hellenistischen Lukas. Dem steht ἀκοὴ mit gleichmäßiger Verteilung über das ganze Neue Testament gegenüber. Dies Überwiegen des Hörens ist ganz deutlich bei Jesus: es kommt alles an auf das Hören und Tun (Mt. 7 24), vergl. „Höret und versteht" Mk. 7 14; Mt. 15 10. „Wer auf Euch hört, der hört auf mich" (Lk. 10 16). Besonders eigentümlich ist die Formel „Sehet, was (oder wie) ihr höret" Mk. 4 24; Lk. 8 18, wobei das βλέπετε ganz abgeblaßt erscheint und so aller Nachdruck auf ἀκούετε liegt. Bei der Verklärung heißt es „auf ihn sollt ihr hören" Mk. 9 7; Lk. 9 35; Mt. 17 5.

Für Paulus ist die Predigt selbst eine ἀκοή (Röm. 10 16; Gal. 3 2, 5) der Glaube ὑπακοή (Röm. 1 3; 16 26). Es kommt also auf das Hören an, um zu glauben (Röm. 10 14). Der Hebräerbrief fordert Achtsamkeit auf das Gehörte (2 1) und mit Psalm 95 7 „Heute, wenn ihr seine Stimme höret" (3 7, 15; 4 7) warnt er vor Unbußfertigkeit. Für Jac. 1 19 ist die Bereitwilligkeit zu hören eine wichtige Forderung. Freilich genügt es nicht, Hörer des Wortes allein zu sein, man soll auch zugleich Täter sein. Das Sehen im Spiegel ist hier nur ein Gleichnis, das Bild für etwas Minderwertiges. (1 22, 23 ff.). Allerdings liegt die Minderwertigkeit nicht an sich im Gedanken des Spiegels. Oden Sal. 13 1 heißt es: „Der Herr ist unser Spiegel". Aber es scheint nach 1. Kor. 13 12, daß das Schauen im Spiegel dem Sehen von Angesicht zu Angesicht entgegengestellt, etwas Undeutliches meint. Dazu kommt bei Jac. 1 22 das Moment des Flüchtigen. Der 1. Johannesbrief betont immer wieder „das Wort, das ihr gehört habt" (2 7, 24; 3 11; 2 18; 4 3) und in 1 1 ff. wird sich der merkwürdige Wechsel in der Reihenfolge „was wir gehört und gesehen haben" V 1 und „was wir gesehen und gehört haben" V. 3 aus einer Überarbeitung erklären: Ursprünglich war wohl nur mit bezug auf das Wort des Lebens von „gehört haben" die Rede, und dies ist mit Rücksicht auf den Gedanken „das Leben ist in Jesus Christus erschienen" umgestellt worden auf „was wir gesehen

haben mit unseren Augen, was wir geschaut haben und unsere Hände betastet haben"; unter Einwirkung der geläufigen Formel von sehen und hören ist dann hier diese Häufung entstanden. Auch im Evangelium spielt das Hören eine außerordentlich große Rolle. Es wird sowohl gebraucht von der Gotteskenntnis, die Jesus selbst hat und den Menschen vermittelt, als von der Aufnahme der Gottesoffenbarung durch die Menschen. Für ersteres vgl. 8 26, 40; 15 15, auch von dem Parakleten wird gesagt „alles was er hört, wird er reden" (16 13), für letzteres 6 45; 8 43, 47; 18 37. Wie die Schafe auf die Stimme ihres Hirten hören, so die Gotteskinder auf Jesu Stimme 10 3, 8, 16, 27.

Unleugbar aber hat sich bei Johannes über diese Grundschicht eine andere gelegt, bei der der Ton auf dem Sehen liegt. Das zeigt sich gleich im Prolog 1 18: „Gott hat niemand je gesehen, ein einzigartiges Gottwesen, das sein Sein hat im Schoße des Vaters, das hat davon berichtet." Dies wird immer wieder im Evangelium hervorgehoben: die Menschen können Gott nicht schauen, der Sohn aber hat ihn gesehen und das befähigt ihn zum Offenbarer (6 46). Deswegen heißt er das Licht der Welt (8 12, 1 4, 9). Allerdings findet sich neben dieser metaphysisch-präexistenziellen Betrachtungsweise eine andere, offenbar ältere: danach ist das Sehen als ein im Leben und Wirken des irdischen Jesus gegenwärtiges gedacht: was der Sohn den Vater tun sieht, tut er gleichermaßen; der Vater zeigt ihm alles, was er tut und wird ihm noch größere Werke zeigen 5 17, 18. Aber diese Linie tritt im Evangelium selbst hinter jener ganz zurück.[16] Dagegen zeigt Joh. 6 45 f f. ganz unmißverständlich, daß das Sehen höher steht als das Hören. Die Menschen können vom Vater hören, aber nur der Sohn hat den Vater gesehen. Und während wir bei Luk. 10 16 den Gedanken fanden, „wer euch hört, hört mich (und letztlich den Vater)," heißt es bei Joh. 14 9 „wer mich gesehen hat, hat den Vater gesehen." Was die Offenbarung Gottes in Jesus selber anlangt, so laufen zwei Gedanken bei Johannes nebeneinander her: „Wir

[16] Ich vermag Lyder Brun „Die Gottesschau des johanneischen Christus" Symbolae Osloensis V 1927 nicht zuzustimmen, wenn er alle johanneischen Stellen nach 5,19 deuten will.

sahen seine Herrlichkeit" (1 14), dazu gehören seine Werke (7 3, 10 32), seine Wunder (2 11); auf der anderen Seite gilt es, seine Worte zu hören, seine Worte sind Zeugnis, seine Worte wirken Glauben und Leben. So wichtig die letztere Linie ist, den Hauptton hat bei Johannes doch die erste.

Es ist auffallend, wie häufig bei Johannes schon in seiner Erzählung vom Sehen die Rede ist, so besonders in Kap. 1, Johannes sieht Jesum kommen (1 29, 36), Jesus sieht zwei Johannes-Jünger ihm nachfolgen (1 38), er sieht Simon Petrus (1 42), er sieht Nathanael zu sich kommen (1 47), dazu das „Kommt und sehet" (1 39, 46), Jesus sah Nathanael unter dem Feigenbaum (1 48, 50), Nathanael soll noch Größeres sehen (1 50), die Jünger werden den Himmel offen sehen (1 51) vgl. ferner 4 29; 5 6; 6 5, 22, 24; 9 11).

Dieser Erzählungsstil, der nicht die Tatsache als solche berichtet, sondern hervorhebt, wie sie sich in einem Beschauer spiegelt, erinnert an die Darstellungsweise der Apokalypsen: „und siehe und ich sah" (Joh. Offenb. 4 1; 7 9; 14 14). Aber ob er sich von hier aus, d. h. von der Identität des Verfassers von Apokalypse und Evangelium, erklärt? Jedenfalls tut sich darin eine Betonung des Visuellen kund. Wir finden bei Johannes manchmal Sehen, wo wir Fühlen erwarten sollten, z. B. 20 20, 25, 27, 29.

Damit hängt auch die häufige Erwähnung des Findens zusammen, 1 41, 43, 45; 5 14; 6 25. Johannes bildet auch die Formel „das Reich Gottes sehen" (3 3) neben „in das Reich Gottes kommen" und „das Leben sehen" (3 36) neben „das Leben haben". Schließlich aber sagt Jesus zu Thomas „dieweil du mich gesehen hast, Thomas, so glaubest du. Selig sind, die nicht sehen und doch glauben" (20 29). Danach scheint das Sehen auch für Johannes nicht das Höchste zu sein. Im übrigen haben wir hier wieder die Selbstaufhebung der eigenen Tendenz, die wir schon oben bei dem „Noli me tangere" besprochen haben.

Soll man nun sagen, Johannes sei, mit der modernen Psychologie zu reden, eine visionell veranlagte Natur und die anderen auditionell? Ich glaube, der Grund liegt nicht in persönlicher Veranlagung, sondern in Bestimmtheit durch volkstümliche Art. Die einen sind offenbar jüdisch beeinflußt, man darf vielleicht

sagen durch das Alte Testament, speziell die Propheten; bei Johannes (genauer vielleicht der Johanneischen Schule) scheinen in diesem Falle griechische oder orientalische Elemente einzuwirken. Dazu kommt ein weiteres. Man kann formulieren, daß in bezug auf die irdische Wirksamkeit Jesu nach den Synoptikern das Hören vorwiegt, in bezug auf den erhöhten Herrn nach dem gesamten apostolischen Kerygma das Sehen: Jesus hat gelehrt und seine Worte werden gehört, der Erhöhte aber erscheint und wird gesehen. Das gilt schon von den Herrenworten in bezug auf die Parusie „Ihr werdet sehen des Menschen Sohn kommen auf den Wolken des Himmels" (Mk. 13 26; Mt. 24 30; Lk. 21 27; Mk. 14 62; Mt. 26 64), das gilt erst recht von den Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen „Dort werdet ihr ihn sehen" (Mk. 16 7; Mt. 28 7, 10). „Habe ich nicht den Herrn gesehen?" fragt Paulus (1. Kor. 9 1), „er ward gesehen" ist das Stichwort für alle Erscheinungen (1. Kor. 15 5ff.; Act. 9 17; 13 31). Mag man dies ὤφθη mit „er erschien" oder besser vielleicht dem passiven ἐγήγερται entsprechend mit „er ward sichtbar gemacht" wiedergeben. Der erhöhte Herr wird gesehen. Es gehört nun zu der für das Johannes-Evangelium charakteristischen Verschiebung, daß dies von dem Auferstandenen und Erhöhten Geltende schon auf den Irdisch-Geschichtlichen übertragen wird. Daher hier das Nebeneinander von „seine Worte hören" und „seine Herrlichkeit sehen".

VI.

Auf einem Gebiet aber hat das Schauen unbedingt den Vorrang; das ist das eschatologische. „Selig sind, die reines Herzens sind, denn sie werden Gott schauen" (Mt. 5 8). Die Gottesschau ist nach diesem Herrenwort der Inbegriff der zukünftigen Seligkeit. Um dies recht zu verstehen, müssen wir wieder auf das Alte Testament zurückgreifen, wo wir als höchste Sehnsucht der Frommen eben das Schauen Gottes finden (Ps. 11 7, 17 15, 42 3, Hiob 19 27; 33 26; Jes. 38 11)[17]. Diese Sehnsucht mag bei

[17] Wolf Wilhelm Graf Baudissin, „Gott schauen" in der alttestamentlichen Religion, Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 1915, S. 173—239; Friedrich Nötscher, Das Angesicht schauen nach biblischer und babylonischer Auffassung, Würzburg 1924.

bei dem Psalmdichter oft gleichbedeutend sein mit dem Wunsch, an den Tempelgottesdiensten teilnehmen zu können (Ps. 27 4, Duhm). Baudissin will auf den Tempelkult nur die Stelle beziehen, wo die Formel „Gottes Angesicht schauen" verwendet ist, vermehrt deren Zahl allerdings beträchtlich, indem er (im Anschluß an Luzzatto und Geiger) annimmt, daß die Formel vor „Gottes Angesicht erscheinen" an den meisten Stellen junge Korrektur für „das Angesicht Gottes sehen" ist. Es kann freilich auch Ausdruck eines Verlangens nach Gemeinschaft und Umgang sein, wie Paulus (Röm. 1 11) der Sehnsucht Ausdruck gibt, die Römer zu sehen, auf daß sie gestärkt und er an ihnen getröstet werde. Hier ist, wie alles Ästhetische, so auch jedes sinnliche Moment ausgeschlossen. Daneben ist unzweifelhaft ein eschatologischer Gedanke vorhanden. Und dieser eschatologische Gedanke durchzieht das ganze Neue Testament (vgl. 1. Kor. 13 12; Hebr. 12 14 ff.; Off. Joh. 22 4)[18]. Er tritt uns vielleicht am klarsten entgegen 1. Joh. 3 2 f. „Meine Lieben, wir sind nun Gottes Kinder, und es ist noch nicht erschienen, was wir sein werden. Wir wissen aber, wenn es erscheinen wird, daß wir ihm gleich sein werden; denn wir werden ihn sehen, wie er ist." Dies läßt eine doppelte Auffassung zu. Die Verklärung in göttliche Lichtgestalt kann als Voraussetzung der Gottesschau verstanden werden; so ist Poimandres I 26 (336,21 Reitzenstein) die Angleichung an die Himmlischen Voraussetzung für das Hören ihrer Lobgesänge; es kann aber auch das Anschauen Gottes als das wirksamste Mittel zur Herstellung der Gott-Ähnlichkeit gemeint sein; man denke an die Geschichte Jacobs und seiner Herde (Gen. 30 37—42). Schon Empedokles weiß davon, daß die Anschauung eines schönen Götterbildes die Gestaltung des Kindes im Mutterschoße beeinflussen kann.[19]

Dies eschatologische Schauen Gottes bzw. des Herrn ist als ein beseligendes gemeint. Daneben aber kann ihm auch ein Moment des Schreckens innewohnen, wenn an den Richter gedacht

[18] Ignatius ad Rom. 6,2 faßt ihn in die Worte *ἄφετέ με καθαρὸν φῶς λαβεῖν*, der Presbyter des Irenäus erklärt (V 36,1): *πανταχοῦ γὰρ ὁ σωτὴρ ὁραθήσεται, καθὼς ἄξιοι ἔσονται οἱ ὁρῶντες αὐτόν.*

[19] Fragment A 81 bei Aëtius V 122 (Diels Doxographi graeci p. 215).

wird. So wenn Jesus seinen Richtern sagt: „Ihr werdet sehen des Menschen Sohn sitzen zur Rechten der Kraft (Majestät Gottes) und kommen mit den Wolken des Himmels" (Mk. 14 62; Mt. 26 64), (vgl. die kleine Apokalypse Mk. 13 26; Mt. 24 30; Lk. 21 27); ebenso wenn das alttestamentliche Wort aus Sach. 12 10: „Sie werden sehen den, in den sie gestochen haben" auf den wiederkommenden Herrn angewandt wird (Joh. 19 37; Apoc. 1 7).

Es muß als Umbildung dieses eschatologischen Gedankens verstanden werden, wenn in den Abschiedsreden des Johannes immer wieder das „Ihr werdet mich sehen" als Trost dargeboten wird (16 16, 17, 19). Das kann den Wiederkunftsgedanken im eschatologischen Sinne umschließen. Nach dem Gesamtdenken des 4. Evangelisten aber wird es eher auf ein geistiges Wiederkommen zu deuten sein (vgl. 14 23; Apoc. 3 20 — mystische Umbiegung) oder es kann auf die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen bezogen werden (vgl. Mk. 16 7. 11; Mt. 28 7 — historische Umbiegung). Ebenso mag es als eine Umbildung des eschatologischen Gedankens aufgefaßt werden, wenn schon von einem gegenwärtigen Schauen Gottes als Heilsgut der Christen die Rede ist. Dies ist nicht mystisch, handelt es sich doch nicht, wie in der Hermetik und bei Philo um eine teilweise durch magische Prozeduren künstlich hergestellte Ekstase, um Atemgymnastik u. dgl. wie in der sogenannten Mithras-Liturgie oder um den mit Eph. 3 18 verwandten ägyptischen Lichtzauber bei Reitzenstein Poimandres 25. Im Neuen Testament handelt es sich vielmehr darum, in der geschichtlichen Gestalt Jesu Christi Gott zu sehen und zu erkennen Joh. 12 45; 14 9: „Wer mich sieht (genauer: gesehen hat), der siehet (hat gesehen) den Vater."

Es gehört zu Gottes Wesen, daß er Geist ist (Joh. 4 24) und als solcher unsichtbar (Kol. 1 15; 1. Tim. 1 17; Hebr. 11 27). Der Geist ist nun an sich unsichtbar (Joh. 3 8; 14 17), aber wie bei einer von Paulus aufgenommenen stoischen Lehre das unsichtbare Wesen Gottes durch die Vernunft an den Schöpfungswerken wahrgenommen werden kann (Röm. 1 20), so hat Gott ein ewiges Ebenbild an seinem Sohne (Kol. 1 15; Hebr. 1 3), und dieses göttliche Ebenbild ist als Mensch in die Geschichte eingetreten (Joh. 1 14)

und damit Gegenstand unseres Sehens geworden. Man kann die seligpreisen, die Jesus Christus und dessen Werke sehen (Mt. 13 16; Lk. 10 23). So ist schon jetzt ein Sehen des Unsichtbaren dem Menschen vergönnt, die Heilszeit ist schon da.

Bei all diesem Schauen als Heilsgut, sei es der Zukunft, sei es der Gegenwart, ist nicht an einen ästhetischen Genuß gedacht. Von der Schönheit ist wohl in den Oden Salomos, aber nicht im Neuen Testament die Rede. Auch der Lichtglanz (δόξα) mag wohl ein ästhetisches Gefühl der Wonne auslösen; er ist aber zunächst als Ausdruck der Majestät und damit als ein Tremendum gedacht (Hebr. 12 29). Dem Schauen liegt auch hier letztlich der Gedanke der Gemeinschaft, des Verkehrs zugrunde, wie wir ihn in Röm 1 11 fanden. Es ist gleichbedeutend mit dem johanneischen „Gott haben" und dem paulinischen „mit Christus sein"[20].

Bei dem Heil der Zukunft handelt es sich in erster Linie um Schauen. Man könnte sich wohl denken, daß daneben auch das Hören himmlischer Sphärenmusik, der Lobgesänge der Engelchöre und lieblicher Töne zur Ausmalung der Seligkeit gehörte wie das im Mittelalter sicher der Fall war. Aber im Neuen Testament ist davon nicht die Rede, abgesehen von den himmlischen Gesängen, die die Johannesoffenbarung (5 9; 14 3) mitteilt. Das Heil der Zukunft wird durchaus visuell vorgestellt. Das kommt klar zum Ausdruck, wenn Paulus (Röm. 8 24) Hoffen und Sehen in Gegensatz bringt. Das Hoffen weist auf das, was wir noch nicht sehen; mit dem Sehen aber findet das Hoffen seine Erfüllung, „Wir wandeln im Glauben, und nicht im Schauen" (2. Kor. 5 7). Das Schauen im Spiegel wird überboten durch das Schauen von Angesicht zu Angesicht (1. Kor. 13 12).

VII.

Liegt so in dem Begriff des Schauens der Gedanke eines Heilsgutes, so tritt in dem des Hörens mehr der der Verpflichtung uns gegenüber. Es geht von dem Hören unwillkürlich über in „das auf jemand (etwas) hören und gehorchen". Dies tritt überall

[20] Vgl. Ernst Lohmeyer Σὺν Χριστῷ in der Festgabe für Adolf Deißmann 1927, 218—257.

da hervor, wo Hören nicht im Gegensatz zu Tun gebraucht ist, sondern selbst den Gedanken des Tuns umschließt. Ersteres ist freilich das sehr viel häufigere: ἀκούειν καὶ ποιεῖν (Mt. 7 24, 26 = Lk. 6 47, 49; Lk. 8 21 — Röm. 2 13; Jac. 1 22 f., 25; ἀκούειν καὶ φυλάσσειν Lk. 11 28; Joh. 12 47; ἀκούειν καὶ πιστεύειν Joh. 5 24.[21] Letzteres aber ist besonders bei Lukas und Johannes nicht minder wichtig. Man denke — abgesehen von den Stellen, wo es von Gott gebraucht, erhören (und damit das Erbetene tun) bedeutet (Joh. 9 27, 31; 11 41 f.; 1. Joh. 5 14 f.) — an die Gottesstimme bei der Verklärung: „auf ihn hört" (Mk. 9 7; Lk. 9 35; Mt. 17 5[22]), an Lk. 10 16: „Wer euch hört, hört mich" richtiger: „Wer auf euch hört, hört auf mich" denn der Gegensatz ist verwerfen, an Lk. 16 29 1 f.: „Auf Moses und die Propheten hören", Act. 3 22 f.: „auf den Propheten hören" und ganz besonders Act. 4 19: „auf euch mehr hören als auf Gott" (hier ganz klar = gehorchen); ferner an Joh. 10 3, 16; 18 37: „auf meine Stimme hören".[23] Man denke an Joh. 5 25 „Die Toten werden seine Stimme hören und die sie hören werden (= ihr gehorchen), werden leben." Das ist nicht identisch mit 5 28; „alle die in den Gräbern sind, werden seine Stimme hören." Es ist im Unterschied von dieser eschatologischen Beziehung auf die allgemeine Totenerweckung sittlich-geistig-innerlich gemeint, ein auf die Stimme des Gottessohnes hören, was nicht bei allen, die sie hören, eintritt. Es ist der Gedanke des Gehorsams gegenüber dem Evangelium, der bei Paulus im Glaubensbegriff eine so bedeutsame Rolle spielt, daß er oft Ungehorsam statt Unglaube als Gegensatz zu Glaube braucht.

Schon bei den Propheten des alten Bundes ist ja das Wort Gottes Ausdruck des göttlichen Willens und dieser Gedanke beherrscht das ganze Urchristentum. Mag als das Wort Gottes die

[21] Philo sagt dafür ἀκούειν καὶ ἀσκεῖν leg. alleg. I 54 (I 74, 13); μανθάνειν καὶ ἀσκεῖν de Abr. 53 (IV 13,10).

[22] Mit der klassischen Regel ἀκούειν τινὰ Person, die man hört; ἀκούειν τινός Sache (oder Person), von der man hört (Blaß-Debrunner 173,1) kommt man im NT nicht durch. Hier gilt weit mehr ἀκούειν τινά jemand hören (im Sinne der Wahrnehmung), ἀκούειν τινός auf jemand hören (im Sinne des Erhörens oder Gehorchens (Blaß-Debrunner 173,2).

[23] Vgl. auch Ignatius ad Eph. 6,2.

frohe Botschaft (Evangelium) vom Reich, das Evangelium von Christus, das Wort vom Kreuz, das Wort von der Versöhnung — mit anderen Worten, Äußerungen des Heilswillens Gottes — oder aber das neue Gebot, das Gebot der Liebe — also Äußerungen des fordernden Willens Gottes — gedacht sein. Eine Ausnahme macht wohl der Begriff des Logos im Prolog, der nicht von dem alttestamentlichen Gedanken des Offenbarungswortes, sondern von dem griechisch-philosophischen der göttlichen Weltvernunft ausgeht. Daß doch auch dieser Begriff leicht im Sinne des Wortes verstanden werden konnte, zeigt Ignatius, der sich bei „logos" immer an das Schweigen als Kontrast erinnert fühlt (λόγος ἀπὸ σιγῆς προελθών ad Magn. 8 2), wie er denn im Schweigen eine höhere Kraft wahrzunehmen glaubt (ad Philad. 1 1). Seine kühne Bildersprache erlaubt ihm, Christus nicht nur als das Wort Gottes, sondern zugleich als den „lügenfreien Mund, in dem der Vater wahrhaftig gesprochen hat" zu bezeichnen (ad Rom. 8 2).

Ganz fehlt dagegen im Neuen Testament die diakritische Funktion des Ohres nicht nur in ästhetischem Sinne der Unterscheidung zwischen Wohllaut und Mißklang, sondern auch in dem ethischen Sinne der Unterscheidung zwischen rechter und unrechter, wahrer und falscher Rede; vgl. Hiob 12 11: „Das Ohr prüft die Rede, wie der Gaumen die Speise." Wo im Neuen Testament auf die Unterscheidung der Geister Bezug genommen wird, da ist dies Sache des ganzen Menschen (1. Joh. 4 1; 1. Thess. 5 21), der dazu ein eigenes Charisma des heiligen Geistes haben kann 1. Kor. 12 10.

VIII.

Endlich kommen die Sinne noch in einem ganz anderen Zusammenhang zur Geltung. Dadurch, daß sie dem Menschen die Eindrücke seiner Umwelt vermitteln, bringen sie zugleich das Versucherische derselben an ihn heran. Dies ist die Grundtendenz der platonischen Anschauung. In die reine Seele kommen aus der schlechten (weil materiellen) Umwelt die sündigen Eindrücke und Reize; daran sind die Sinne schuld. Diese Grundanschauung hat sich von Plato der Jude Philo angeeignet. Wir finden sie in der hermetischen Gnosis. Sie ist herrschend auch bei den Mandäern.

Das gilt nach jüdisch-rabbinischer Psychologie von den Gliedern im allgemeinen (vgl. zu Röm. 7 23; Kol. 3 5). Jesus nennt als das, was den Menschen ärgern kann, d. h. ihm Versuchung bringt, des Menschen Hand, Fuß und Auge Mk. 9 43—48 (Mt. 18 8, 9): mit der Hand stiehlt man, mit dem Fuß eilt man zu Blutvergießen (Jes. 59 7 = Röm. 3 16), das Auge aber verlockt zu Ehebruch. So sind die 3 großen Gebote des Dekalogs in diesen drei Gliedern dargestellt.[24] Auch hier aber tritt das Auge leicht an die erste Stelle, vgl. die Fassung des Wortes bei Mt. 5 29 f. Schon bei der Versuchung der Stammeltern heißt es „und Eva schaute an, daß von dem Baume gut zu essen war und lieblich anzusehen war..... und aß" Gen. 3 6. So ist Augenlust neben Fleischeslust und hoffärtigem Leben eines der Kennzeichen der Welt und ihrer Vergänglichkeit und ungöttlichen Verführung (1. Joh. 2 16 f.).

Es ist merkwürdig, daß in diesem Zusammenhang keiner der anderen Sinne im Neuen Testament genannt wird, auch nicht der Geschmacksinn, obwohl in der mönchischen Ethik der späteren Kirche gula, die Kehle, als eine der Hauptsünden (trägerinnen) erscheint. Auch das Neue Testament warnt vor Völlerei (Röm. 13 13; 1. Kor. 6 10; Eph. 5 18; Lk. 21 34), aber dabei ist volkstümlich an das Übermaß in Essen und Trinken gedacht, nicht an die Feinschmeckerei der höheren Klassen. Es wird nicht auf den Geschmackssinn Bezug genommen.

Gerade im Vergleich zu griechisch-orientalischen Gedankengängen muß im Neuen Testament auffallen, wie wenig von Entsinnlichung im strengen Sinne des Wortes hier die Rede ist. Bei Plato, bei Philo und in der Hermetik ist das Ausschalten der Sinne die unerläßliche Voraussetzung für wahre Erkenntnis Gottes und der übersinnlichen Welt zugleich für Reinheit des Lebens.[25]

[24] Umfassender erscheint der Gedanke in dem Sündenbekenntnis der mandäischen Gemeinde (R. Ginza II 2, S. 57), wo 9 Glieder als Träger von 9 Sünden aufgezählt werden: Haupt = Sünde, Augen = Unkeuschheit, Ohren = Lästerung, Mund = Lüge, Hand = Diebstahl, Herz = böse Gedanken, Leib = Ehebruch, Knie = Götzendienst, Fuß = Verunreinigung durch Barfußgehen (!).

[25] Hermes Trismegistos fordert geradezu, die Sinne zu hassen I 22 (13,6); IV 6 (37,6ff.). Die somatische Funktion der αἰσθήσεις muß aus-

Auch Paulus kann von einer Abtötung der Glieder sprechen Kol. 3 5, aber dies ist ethisch und nicht im eigentlichen Sinne asketisch gemeint. Eine Leibesverstümmelung kennt das Urchristentum nicht; Gal. 5 12, ist durchaus ironisch gemeint.

Eine eigentliche asketische Tendenz der Entsinnlichung ist im Urchristentum schon darum ausgeschlossen, weil hier die Bewegung nicht sowohl von außen nach innen, als von innen nach außen geht. Es sind nicht wie im Platonismus die Sinne, welche der reinen Seele die bösen materiellen Eindrücke aus der Außenwelt vermitteln und sie dadurch verführen, sondern es ist das Herz im Innern des Menschen selbst, von welchem die bösen Gedanken ausgehen (Mk. 7 21).

IX.

Das ist für die urchristliche Psychologie bezeichnend, daß hinter den Sinnen das Herz steht. Es handelt sich hier nicht so sehr um das rezeptive Zentralorgan, in das die Sinne ihre Eindrücke ablagern — so etwa in der Psychologie des Aristoteles —, sondern das Herz ist der Sitz aller Regungen im Menschen; es macht sich die Sinne untertan: Wes das Herz voll ist, geht der Mund über (Mt. 12 34). Es kommt darauf an, daß das Herz rein sei (Mt. 5 8; 1. Tim. 1 5). Schon im alten Testament ist viel von dem rechten oder richtigen Herzen die Rede (2. Kön. 10 15; Spr. 27 21 καρδία εὐθεῖα); Salomo betete um ein reines, verständiges Herz (1 Kön. 3 9, 12; vgl. Sprüche 10 8); dem zerbrochenen Herzen (Ps. 34 19; Jes. 61 1) steht das fröhliche Herz gegenüber (Sprüche 17 22; Sirach 30 23, 27, 50 25); mit ganzem Herzen soll man Gott lieben (Deut. 6 5, 11 13, 26 16; Josua 22 5; Mk. 12 30); von ganzem Herzen ihn suchen (Jerem. 19 13; Ps. 119 2, 10), aber andererseits „alles Dichten und Trachten des Menschenherzens ist böse immerdar (Gen. 6 5, 8 21), vgl. Koh. 9 3 sein Herz ist ferne von Gott (Jes. 19 13); es weicht von Gott (Jer. 17 5); es ist ein trotzig

geschaltet werden. I 1 (1,4f.); XIII 6,7 (118,5ff., 15f.). Es ist ein Vorzug der Guten, daß sich die leiblichen Sinneswahrnehmungen im Tode auflösen I 24 (14,9ff.). Diese Auflösung kann schon jetzt erfolgen, und das bedeutet dann göttliche Neugeburt XIII 10 (121,5ff.). Die Sinne sind denen der unvernünftigen Tiere gleich IV 5 (36,8ff.).

und verzagt Ding (Jer. 17 9). So heißt es auch im Neuen Testament „aus dem Herzen kommen arge Gedanken" (Mt. 15 19). „Ein guter Mensch bringt Gutes hervor aus seinem guten Schatz des Herzens, und ein böser Mensch bringt Böses hervor aus seinem bösen Schatz" (Mt. 12 35). Diese starke Betonung des Herzens ist durchaus charakteristisch für die Religion Jesu mit ihrer Betonung der Innerlichkeit, mit ihrer starken Einschätzung der Verantwortlichkeit des Menschen und der durchaus empirisch nüchternen Würdigung seiner sittlichen Einstellung. Nicht die Umwelt wird verantwortlich gemacht, auch nicht die deren Eindrücke vermittelnden Sinne, sondern der Mensch selbst mit seinem widergöttlich bestimmten Willen. Wenn Jes. 6 10 ff. = Mt. 13 15 „mit den Augen sehen und mit den Ohren hören und mit dem Herzen verstehen" den Eindruck erwecken könnte, als wäre letzteres Folge von den ersteren beiden, so zeigt doch der Anfang des Verses, daß die Verstockung des Herzens als Grund für die Taubheit der Ohren und die Blindheit der Augen angesehen wird. Es geht eben bei den Propheten wie bei Jesus der Weg des Bösen von innen nach außen und nicht umgekehrt. Anders bei den Griechen. Hier steht an der Stelle des Herzens der Nûs, mit Sehen und Hören verbindet sich das *νοεῖν* (Hermes Trismegistos XIII 5 (123, 16) u. ö.).

X.

Schließlich aber sind die Sinne doch nicht bloß eine Gefahr. Sie sind ein für den Menschen unentbehrliches Mittel, nicht nur mit der Außenwelt in Verbindung zu treten, sondern auch seinen Gedanken und Vorstellungen Ausdruck zu geben. Auch wo es sich um das Übersinnliche handelt, kann der Mensch die Bilder der Sinnlichkeit nicht entbehren. So rein geistig der Gottesgedanke bei Jesus und im ganzen Neuen Testament ist dank der jahrhundertelangen Schulung des Judentums, so sehen wir Jesus doch von dem Finger Gottes (Lk. 11 20 vgl. Oden Sal. 23 19), dem Angesicht Gottes (Mt. 18 10) reden. Diese volkstümlichen Anthropromorphismen sind gerade für eine kräftige Religiosität kennzeichnend. Diese spricht davon, daß wir Gott schauen sollen von Angesicht zu Angesicht (1. Kor. 13 12). Diese kleidet

hre Gewißheit von Gottes Fürsorge, Gebetserhörung und Vergeltung in die Bilder: „Denn die Augen des Herrn merken auf die Gerechten und seine Ohren auf ihr Gebet; das Angesicht des Herrn aber steht wider die, die Böses tun“ (1 Petr. 3 12). Der Fromme tröstet sich dessen, daß Gott hören und sehen kann „Der das Ohr gebildet hat, sollte der nicht hören? Der das Auge gemacht hat, sollte der nicht sehen?“ (Ps. 94 9).

Man hat neuerdings von dem Imago-Charakter der Religion geredet.[26] Ist darunter verstanden, daß uns alles Vergängliche ein Gleichnis des Ewigen, alles Irdische ein Gleichnis des Göttlichen werden kann und soll, so ist dies durchaus im Sinne Jesu und seiner Jünger.

[26] C. A. Bernoulli, RGG² III 186—189.

LEXICAL NOTES ON LUKE-ACTS

IV. ON DIRECT QUOTATION, WITH SOME USES OF ὅτι AND εἰ.

HENRY J. CADBURY
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

THE comparative rareness of sustained indirect speech whether statement, command or question is a well known difference of the Greek of the classical and Hellenistic periods from our own language. The abundance of prolonged *oratio indirecta* in Latin is familiar to even the beginner, and in this respect Latin even more than modern languages contrasts with the Greek. In Hebrew, on the other hand, the indirect method of quotation is more infrequent than in Greek. Even thinking is expressed by the Semites as direct speech, — to one's self or in one's heart. The New Testament, therefore, not only because of its own Greek idiom, but also by the reinforcement of such Semitic influences as lie behind it, may be expected to display an abundant supply of examples of direct speech.

The object of this paper is not to discuss these phenomena as a whole. It is limited, like all the notes in this series, to the writings of Luke, and its aim is to point out certain evidences of direct statement or question in his writings that have not been always so recognized. Several reasons make it probable that such unrecognized instances exist. It cannot be said that scholars have in the past ignored the Greek penchant for direct speech. But there is an inevitable tendency to understand an ambiguous

foreign text in accordance with our own idiom. Further the modern study of Hellenistic grammar enables us now to postulate certain popular idioms as probably familiar to the New Testament writers of which earlier grammarians were not aware. The use of participles[1] and of infinitives[2] in place of direct imperatives, and the recognition of ὅτι as a direct interrogative (see below) are cases in point.

That the line between direct and indirect statement was less clear in antiquity than now, is due in part to the outward circumstances of expression. Ancient writing was intended for the ear. Writing now, much oftener than was true then, is intended for the eye. Our punctuation also provides a means of discrimination that was not presented even to the eyes of the ancients. The direct expression is trebly marked in a modern sentence, by the introductory comma or colon, by the initial capital, and by the enveloping inverted commas.

One aspect of Greek idiom which makes the distinction slight between direct and indirect is the lack in Greek of change of tenses after verbs of saying and the like. English requires after a past tense a change of tense, so that "I know and will obey" when quoted becomes "he said that he *knew* and *would* obey." The Greek as a rule retains the tense of the original and, except for the optative after past tenses (an obsolescent idiom in the Koine but in the New Testament used by Luke sometimes in indirect

[1] That the participle is used like a principal verb in the imperative was claimed for the N. T. and the papyri by J. H. Moulton in *Expositor*, Dec. 1904, p. 450 and *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, i. 180f. This is denied for the Ptolemaic papyri by E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri*, II. i. 340f. As none of the instances claimed are in Luke-Acts we may leave the matter open.

[2] See L. Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*², 1925, pp. 179ff. The independent infinitive had already become stereotyped in the epistolary χαίρειν as in Acts 15 23; 23 26. Perhaps other instances are to be found in the close neighborhood of each of those passages, viz. 15 28, ἔδοξε . . . μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος πλὴν τῶν ἐπάναγκες τούτων. 29 ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων κτλ. 23 23, εἶπεν, ἑτοιμάσατε στρατιώτας διακοσίους . . . 24 κτήνη τε παραστῆσαι, ἵνα κτλ.

questions, always correctly in secondary sequence) retains after ὅτι the same mood as well as the same tense.

A thoroughly ambiguous feature of the Greek idiom, at least in its Hellenistic stage, is the use of ὅτι. This particle not only introduces an indirect statement after verbs of speaking but has also an extensive recitative use equivalent to our quotation marks in direct statement. In cases where no forms of the first or second person occur in the quotation one is usually without clue as to which of the two it is, and modern editors follow their own judgment.[3] But an ancient writer, reader, or hearer would have no necessity of deciding there which construction of ὅτι is used.

The writings of Luke do not respresent in the matter of direct quotation the extreme of popular idiom. They are said to show less of the *oratio directa* than those of the other evangelists. A comparison of parallel passages between Luke and Mark discloses some instances where Mark's direct expressions are put by Luke in indirect form or are otherwise eliminated.[4]

Of ὅτι recitative also there is some reduction of use on Luke's part.[5] It is said to be a construction especially characteristic of Mark.[6] Yet a considerable number of instances are found in Luke's writings. Hawkins gives the "very striking cases in which *oratio directa* immediately and certainly follows ὅτι" as numbering in Luke 13, Acts 14. But he also lists as doubtful cases 15 in Luke and 8 in Acts.

Especial interest attaches to those passages where Luke appears to begin with *oratio obliqua* and to end with *oratio recta*. In a footnote to an out of the way article, J. B. Lightfoot commenting on Acts 14 22 declared, "This abrupt transition from the

[3] Westcott and Hort indicate their choice by capitalizing or not capitalizing the word that follows ὅτι.

[4] Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method of Luke*, 1920, pp. 80f.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 139ff.

[6] Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 1899, pp. 28, 41. But in the second edition (1909) this is withdrawn from the "list of words and phrases characteristic of Mark's Gospel."

oblique to the direct narrative is especially characteristic of St. Luke's style, and one subsidiary proof of the unity of authorship between different parts of the Acts and between the Acts and the third Gospel. Winer, *Gramm.* § 64, III. 2 gives only a few instances out of many".[7] Harnack shows how in Acts this phenomenon is widely distributed among the possible sources.[8]

Three conspicuous examples are the following:

Luke 5 14, *καὶ αὐτὸς παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν· ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ, καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου καθὼς προσέταξεν Μωυσῆς εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.*

Acts 1 4, *καὶ συναλιζόμενος παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου.*

Acts 23 22, *ὁ μὲν οὖν χιλίαρχος ἀπέλυσε τὸν νεανίσκον παραγγείλας μηδενὶ ἐκλαλῆσαι ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρὸς ἐμέ.*

In each of these passages the verb is *παραγγέλλω*. It begins with an infinitive construction but in each case some forms in the second person and, in the last two, forms in the first person show that the direct speech has come in subsequently. The distribution of this idiom binds together, as Lightfoot said, the two books Luke and Acts and even two parts of Acts. The latter point is particularly interesting since Torrey in support of his theory of an Aramaic source for Acts 1—15 36 remarks of Acts 1 4: "The transition to direct discourse, in just this manner, is the usual thing in Aramaic.[9]" But such transitions are natural in the Greek also[10]

[7] *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology,* III (March 1856), p. 95. The reference to Winer should be § 63, II. 2 where Acts 23 22; 23 23, 24; Luke 5 14 are noted as examples.

[8] *The Acts of the Apostles,* Eng. Trans., p. 228.

[9] *The Composition and Date of Acts,* 1916, p. 24.

[10] Of many discussions that might be cited I mention only E. Kieckers, „Zur oratio recta in den indogermanischen Sprachen," *Indogermanische Forschungen* xxxvi (1915), pp. 51—53. Illustrations from the papyri have not, so far as I know, been collected. I quote one picked up at random: *P. Amh.* II. 30, lines 28—36 (ii/ B. C.) *ὁμοίως καὶ* [sc. *προσκληθέντος*] *Κονδύλου ἑνὸς τῶν ἁλιείων προσεμαρτύρει ἔχειν τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Τεσενούφιος συνγραφὰς τῆς δηλουμένης οἰκίας καὶ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἠναγκάσθην* (sic) *ὑπὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἀποστατῶν ἐνέγκαι τὰς συνγραφὰς καὶ ταύτας κατακαῦσαι.*

and he has overlooked the example at 23 22 in a section of the book that he regards as unmarked by Semitic idiom.[11]

In two other instances the transition from indirect speech is more gently made with the help of an inserted expression:

Acts 7 6, *ἐλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτὸ καὶ κακώσουσιν ἔτη τετρακόσια,* 7 *καὶ τὸ ἔθνος ᾧ ἂν δουλεύσουσιν κρινῶ ἐγώ, ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται κτλ.*

Acts 25 4, *ὁ μὲν οὖν Φῆστος ἀπεκρίθη τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον εἰς Καισαρίαν , ἑαυτὸν δὲ μέλλειν ἐν τάχει ἐκπορεύεσθαι.* 5 *οἱ οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν, φησίν, δυνατοὶ συνκαταβάντες εἴ τί ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἄτοπον κατηγορείτωσαν αὐτοῦ.*

In both instances the explanatory words *ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν* or *φησίν* occur immediately after the words which by their person betray the emerging of *oratio recta.* In 25 5 the *φησίν* actually separates the article and its substantive. In Acts 7 6 the author fell into difficulty. Quoting from the LXX, at first he recast the *oratio recta* into *obliqua*, substituting for *σού* the third person *αὐτοῦ.* But as his quotation continued he found it expedient to retain the persons of the original and so at the point of transition interjected by way of repetition *ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν.* That it is an insertion appears clearly from the very typography of modern Greek texts of Acts in which words from the Old Testament are printed in a special face of type. The LXX text of Gen. 15 13 *f.* is as follows: *καὶ ἐρρέθη πρὸς Ἀβράμ· γινώσκων γνώσῃ ὅτι πάροικον ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ κακώσουσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτοὺς τετρακόσια ἔτη. τὸ δὲ ἔθνος ᾧ ἐὰν δουλεύσωσι κρινῶ ἐγώ· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται κτλ.*

[11] Acts 23 23f., the next verses, are often regarded as a change in the reverse direction from *oratio recta* (imperative *ἑτοιμάσατε*) to *obliqua* (infinitive *παραστῆσαι*), but see above note 2. Cf. Luke 9 3, *μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν, μήτε ῥάβδον, μήτε ἄρτον, μήτε ἀργύριον, μήτε δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν.* Contrast Mark 6 8, the parallel passage, which has three constructions perhaps all different, *καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον, μὴ ἄρτον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν· ἀλλ' ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια· καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσησθε δύο χιτῶνας.* In general the transition from direct to indirect statement is much less frequent than the reverse.

The use of the interjected *φησίν* is particularly idiomatic, both the word and its position in the sentence. Josephus, who (or whose collaborators) surpassed in extended indirect discourse, repeatedly relapses into direct, interpolating *φησί*, *ἔφη* or *εἶπεν*, just at the tell-tale words that reveal the direct style.[12]

Another form of transition from indirect to direct discourse is accomplished by the insertion of *ὅτι*. This is most clearly shown in Acts 14 21, *ὑπέστρεψαν . . . ἐπιστηρίζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν μαθητῶν*, 22 *παρακαλοῦντες ἐμμένειν τῇ πίστει καὶ ὅτι διὰ πολλῶν θλίψεων δεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*. Three explanations of the *ἡμᾶς* in this passage are possible and have been long the subject of debate. (1) It is another 'we passage' like those later in the book by which the author shows that he with others was present at the occasion referred to. (2) It is a reference to the author and the readers under an inclusive pronoun. It means in this case "all we as Christians." Such a usage would find possible parallels in the two uses of *ἡμῖν* in Luke 1 1, 2. (3) The words of Paul and Barnabas are being now directly quoted. They are saying of themselves and their hearers in the cities of Asia Minor, "We Christians must enter the kingdom of God through many tribulations." The third is doubtless the correct explanation. *παρακαλέω* then is followed first by an infinitive representing a command, and then by *ὅτι* recitative and a direct quotation.

[12] Krenkel, *Josephus und Lucas*, 1894, pp. 329ff., gives as examples of this *φησί Antt.* vi. 13, 4; vi. 13, 7; ix. 4, 4; x. 7, 6; xi. 6, 8; xiii. 13, 2, also five cases with an interjected *εἶπεν* and thirty-two instances of transition from indirect to direct without any new *verbum dicendi*. Of changes in reverse direction he notes two, and of changes in both directions in the same passage, five. Probably the lists are not exhaustive but they are sufficient. We may submit as further possible cases of change to direct discourse Luke 19 13 *εἶπε πρὸς αὐτοὺς πραγματεύσασθαι ἕως ἔρχομαι*, Acts 20 01 *εἶπεν μὴ θορυβεῖσθαι* (BCD) *ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστίν*, 21 33 *ἐπυνθάνετο τίς εἴη καὶ τί ἐστιν πεποιηκώς*.

That ὅτι recitative occurs elsewhere in combination with other clauses seems altogether probable, though the combination is somewhat awkward. Here are a few of the cases where either direct or indirect statement is possible, and where I think the direct is preferable.

Luke 7 16, ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες ὅτι προφήτης μέγας ἠγέρθη ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.

Luke 9 7, καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπό τινων ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν, 8 ὑπό τινων δὲ ὅτι Ἠλείας ἐφάνη, ἄλλων δὲ ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη.

Luke 9 18, τίνα με οἱ ὄχλοι λέγουσιν εἶναι; οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπαν Ἰωάννην τὸν Βαπτιστήν, ἄλλοι δὲ Ἠλείαν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη.

Luke 24 33, εὗρον ἠθροισμένους τοὺς ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς, λέγοντας ὅτι ὄντως ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι.

In all these passages occurs either ἠγέρθη or ἀνέστη.[13]

At 7 16 the direct nature of the first clause is evident. Probably all the other instances are *oratio recta*. With the ὄντως of Luke 24 34 compare the same word in *oratio recta* at 23 47 (contrast Mark 11 32). At 7 16 the clause in question is followed by another in ὅτι. Probably this also is recitative. Such exclamations tend to use ὅτι recitative as is evident in Luke 5 26, ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου λέγοντες ὅτι εἴδαμεν παράδοξα σήμερον. And there is no objection to two ὅτι recitative clauses in succession from the same speaker. Also contrasting speakers use direct discourse in Acts 2 12 f; 17 18, 32, though only at 2 13 is the ὅτι *recitantis* to be found as we have suggested of the alternative speakers at Luke 9 7. On the other hand the passage Luke 9 18, so near to it in thought as well as in position, appears to be *oratio variata*. The first replies are in the accusative (with an infinitive to be supplied[14]), the last has ὅτι with either direct or indirect statement. It is not impossible for Greek writers to

[13] The verb should be translated as an English perfect but the Greek form is past.

[14] Or shall we regard the accusatives as objects of λέγουσιν in the sense καλοῦσιν or ὀνομάζουσιν?

change from the infinitive of direct statement to the ὅτι clause of indirect statement,[15] but the analogies that we have considered incline us to the view that the ὅτι clause is direct quotation.

[15] Note that at Acts 27 10 the ὅτι and infinitive constructions occur in the same clause — possibly a mere oversight, as the many intervening words have led the author to forget how he began: *ἄνδρες, θεωρῶ ὅτι μετὰ ὕβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ζημίας οὐ μόνον τοῦ φορτίου καὶ τοῦ πλοίου ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι τὸν πλοῦν.* Such phenomena occur also in other Hellenistic authors. Examples may be found in Keelhoff, *Revue de 'l Instruction publique en Belgique*, xxxviii (1895), pp. 166ff., or by running down the earlier commentators listed in Winer's *Grammar*, § 44 Note 2; § 63 I. 2c. The latter says (English Trans. by W. F. Moulton, 1870 and later, pp. 426f.). "It occurs so frequently in the best writers . . . that the construction had almost ceased to be felt by the Greek as an anacoluthon. We can only ascribe to the ὅτι a *vis monstrandi* as when it stands before the *oratio directa.*" Another instance which textual critics have corrected and grammarians overlooked is Acts 16 19, *ὡς δὲ εἶδαν οἱ κύριοι τῆς παιδίσκης ὅτι ἀπεστερῆσθαι τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτῶν.*

After J. H. Moulton we may cite from the papyri *P. Oxy* 237 (ii A. D.) *δηλῶν ὅτι εἰ τὰ ἀληθῆ φανείη μηδὲ κρίσεως δεῖσθαι τὸ πρᾶγμα.* Other examples are in Aristeas 125, Philo Byz. 77, 6, Diodorus Siculus v. 56, 3. The construction is of course in no sense direct discourse and therefore this long note is out of place here. It is justified only because the ὅτι strengthening the infinitive of *oratio obliqua* is perhaps akin to the ὅτι recitative strengthening the *oratio recta.*

The construction at Acts 27 10 *θεωρῶ ὅτι μέλλειν,* raises other questions. (1) There are in Greek literature instances of ὡς with the infinitive like these with ὅτι and the infinitive. Is ὡς used in like manner in cases where normally oblique constructions are in the participle? At Acts 17 22 we read *κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ.* I think the ὡς does not directly modify the adjective. Has the verb *θεωρῶ* here again a helping particle in ὡς in place of *θεωρῶ ὑμᾶς εἶναι* or *θεωρῶ ὑμᾶς ὄντας*? Cf. *P. Tebt* 58, 24 (iii B. C.), *θεωρήσας με ὡς προσεδρεύοντα καθ' ἡμέραν.* (2) The same infinitive *μέλλειν* occurs in the involved sentence in 19 27, *οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῦτο κινδυνεύει ἡμῖν τὸ μέρος εἰς ἀπελεγμὸν ἐλθεῖν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῆς μεγάλης θεᾶς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν εἰς οὐθὲν λογισθῆναι μέλλειν τε καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι τῆς μεγαλειότητος αὐτῆς.* The *μέλλειν καθαιρεῖσθαι* could of course depend on *κινδυνεύει* but because it seemed awkward Buttmann and Meyer preferred to suppose that the *oratio recta* (Demetrius the silversmith is speaking) has turned into indirect. See note 11. (3) *μέλλειν* of *oratio obliqua* figures once more in a mixed construction at 25 4, being preceded by an another infinitive clause,

In this connection we may inquire whether a different type of zeugma involving ὅτι recitative occurs in the following:

Acts 9 27, *διηγήσατο αὐτοῖς πῶς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶδεν τὸν κύριον καὶ ὅτι ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ καὶ πῶς ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐπαρρησιάσατο ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ.*

Acts 14 27, *ἀνήγγελλον ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξεν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν θύραν πίστεως.*

In the latter case the parallel in Acts 11 28, *ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες· ἆρα καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὁ θεὸς τὴν μετάνοιαν εἰς ζωὴν ἔδωκεν*, suggests that the ὅτι may be recitative. In the former instance there is not only the alternative of indirect statement but of ὅτι as a relative 'whatever' or indirect interrogative 'what'. At Luke 8 47 and 24 35 we have a similar use of ὡς in combination with a different construction. And this suggests that at least Acts 9 27 is not recitative. Observe that in all these mixed examples the verb is a verb of 'reporting'.

A sentence with two clauses in ὅτι is in Acts 17 3, *διανοίγω καὶ παρατιθέμενος ὅτι τὸν χριστὸν ἔδει παθεῖν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός, ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὃν ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν.* The grammatical person of the last words shows that in the end we have *oratio recta.* There are three possibilities. (1) If it begins in the middle of the last clause, we have a case of transition like those mentioned on p. 415. (2) If it begins with the second ὅτι clause, it is a case of double construction something like Acts 14 22. (3) But both clauses may be regarded as *oratio recta* as at Luke 7 16. Perhaps some reason for treating the first clause as *oratio recta* is found in the frequency with which Luke's favorite δεῖ sentences are thus given in recitative. Compare among others Luke 4 43; 9 22; 24 7, 44, cf. 46; Acts 1 16 and 14 22 (above), and contrast Acts 24 24.

The three examples just cited from Luke 24, perhaps require some comment:

Luke 24 6, *μνήσθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἔτι ὢν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ,*

and followed by *oratio recta.* See above, p. 416. Evidently *μέλλειν* in Luke-Acts needs to be watched. Cf. note 19.

7 λέγων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὅτι δεῖ παραδοθῆναι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ἁμαρτωλῶν. Here the position of ὅτι suggests that τὸν υἱόν is the proleptic object of λέγων as in the familiar "I know thee, who thou art."[16] If so, can ὅτι be recitative? Or is υἱὸν the subject of παραδοθῆναι?

Luke 24 44, εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὢν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα . . . περὶ ἐμοῦ. In this case of self-quotation the ὅτι, even with the following ἐμοῦ, may be indirect, but it may also be direct, an explanation of the preceding noun λόγοι. In like manner the risen Jesus refers to his earlier words in Acts 1 4f. (see above) . . . περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου· ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι κτλ. Here too the clause is probably self-quotation, giving the contents of the ἐπαγγελίαν heard from Jesus' lips. It is not easy to translate so, but the easier translation 'because' is hardly right.[17]

Luke 24 45, τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς, 46 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν . . . 48 ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς κτλ. I have treated this as a case of ὅτι recitative. Is it a case of *oratio obliqua* with ὅτι, ultimately changing to *recta*?[18]

Turning to the interrogative constructions we may first consider a passage which in thought belongs closely to those just examined on the fulfilment of scripture:

Acts 26 22, οὐδὲν ἐκτὸς λέγων ὧν τε οἱ προφῆται ἐλάλησαν μελ-

[16] Cf. Mark 11 32, ἅπαντες εἶχον τὸν Ἰωάννην ὅτι προφήτης ἦν, Acts 9 20, ἐκήρυσσεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

[17] A. T. Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek N. T.*, p. 1033, says, "It is sometimes doubtful whether ὅτι is declarative or causal." His example is a double ὅτι passage, Acts 22 29, καὶ ὁ χιλίαρχος δὲ ἐφοβήθη ἐπιγνοὺς ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστιν καὶ ὅτι ἦν αὐτὸν δεδεκώς.

[18] If the passage so similar in thought at Acts 26 23 is direct interrogative (see p. 422) there is something to be said for regarding ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται κτλ. as direct interrogative here, with ὅτι 'why' (see pp. 423ff.). Yet ὅτι δεῖ is hardly, 'Why is it necessary?' in Luke 24 7, 44; Acts 17 3.

λόντων γίνεσθαι καὶ Μωυσῆς, 23 εἰ παθητὸς ὁ χριστὸς, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει[19] καταγγέλλειν τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

The εἰ here can of course be translated 'if', though it has no apodosis. It is sometimes regarded as equivalent to ὅτι. But Rendel Harris in his studies on *testimonia* suggests an interrogative interpretation. He says:

> "No one, as far as I know, has succeeded in translating this sentence. The RV margin comes nearest to it, with the suggested 'whether' for εἰ. It is clearly interrogative: 'Does the Messiah suffer, and does he first rise from the dead, etc.?' The words are headlines of Testimonies, awkwardly incorporated in the text, and are betrayed as such by the previous references to the prophets and Moses, who are to answer the questions."[20]

What concerns us here is not the theory of *testimonia* but the question of grammar. That εἰ may be interrogative, even in a direct question, is familiar to us now. Among the New Testament writers Luke uses it so most frequently.[21] With direct questions εἰ occurs also in the LXX. So far as I know the construction has not yet been freed from the suspicion of Semitism. The awkwardness of construction in Acts 26 23 is bad enough in any case. At no point does the grammar of Acts so much need 'light from the dead.' That the two εἰ clauses are interrogative is as good an explanation as the alternatives. It is not impossible that they are even direct questions.

Acts 10 18, φωνήσαντες ἐπύθοντο (or ἐπυνθάνοντο) εἰ Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος ἐνθάδε ξενίζεται. This is a more certain

[19] So ABL 13, but in view of what is said above in note 15 *sub fine* perhaps we should read here another anomalous μέλλειν with ℵ* 81 HP 31 61.

[20] *Testimonies*, Part I, 1916, pp. 19f. A similar suggestion for Luke 24 45f. I have added in note 18.

[21] Luke 13 23; 22 49; Acts 1 6; 7 1; 21 37; 22 25. The best examples elsewhere in the N. T. are perhaps Matt. 12 10; 19 3 (= Mark 10 2), in all of which the question (indirect?) is εἰ ἔξεστι. Even if with Moffat we move 26 8 to precede 26 23 the εἰ clauses (now three in succession, dependent on ἄπιστον κρίνεται) are hardly conditional but interrogative or declarative.

case of unrecognized direct question in Luke-Acts. The translators generally render it as indirect: "They called and asked whether Simon which was surnamed Peter were lodging there." I would render it as direct: "They called and asked, 'Is Simon which is surnamed Peter lodging here?'" The Greek, unlike the English, would make no difference in the tense of the dependent verbs or in the choice of the adverb. At least twice in Acts (4 7; 23 19) πυνθάνομαι precedes a direct question.

The decisive reason for preferring to regard this sentence as quoted is, however, the use of the phrase 'Simon which is called Peter.' This author quite strictly distinguishes certain terms for speeches and dialogue and others for narrative.[22] Elsewhere in this scene Peter in narrative is called simply Peter, but in dialogue the same passage uses three times the unique and cumbrous expression Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος (ὃς ἐπικαλεῖται) Πέτρος (10 5, 32; 11 13). I believe the question with εἰ in 10 18 is to be regarded as a direct quotation because it also includes Σίμων ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος Πέτρος.[23]

Another unclassical particle of direct question is ὅτι, 'why?' The grammarians have been forced to admit its presence in Mark.[24] So far as I know it has not been claimed for Luke, though

[22] Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 1927, pp. 225ff.

[23] Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*[2], p. 195 note 4, seems to recognize an εἰ *recitativum* in Luke 22 67, ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν λέγοντες εἰ Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός; εἰπὸν ἡμῖν. But we have in John 10 24, καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ Ἕως πότε τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἴρεις· εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἰπὸν ἡμῖν παρρησίᾳ. Cf. John 20 15. In these cases we have as alternatives conditional, direct interrogative, and indirect interrogative uses of εἰ.

[24] Blass-Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, § 300,2. Field, *Notes on the Translation of the N. T.*, 1899, p. 33, approved ὅτι of direct interrogation in Mark 9 11 and 28, though he could quote other Biblical or classical evidence only for its use in indirect interrogation. Abbott, *Corrections of Mark*, 1901, § 357*a* gives some LXX examples. Hawkins, in the same edition in which he dropped ὅτι recitative as characteristic of Mark (see above p. 414, note 6), added ὅτι interrogative, as found in Mark 2 16 (?); 9 11 and 9 28 but not elsewhere in the N. T. Another possible N. T. example is the famous *crux interpretum* John 7 25, τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ

Luke knew and understood it in Mark. Three cases in Mark (not without variants) are 2 16, ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει, where Matt. 9 11 and Luke 5 30 both have διὰ τί for ὅτι; Mark 9 11, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἠλείαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον, where Matt. 17 10 has for the first ὅτι the words τί οὖν; Mark 9 28, οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κατ᾽ ἰδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθη εν ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτό, where Matt. 17 19 has διὰ τί.

The most likely case of ὅτι interrogative in Luke-Acts seems to me to be Acts 11 3 where (not without variants) we read διεκρίνοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς λέγοντες ὅτι εἰσῆλθες πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβυστίαν ἔχοντας καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς. A statement, whether in the second or third person (for some authorities read εἰσῆλθεν . . . συνέφαγεν), seems somewhat jejune compared with a forceful interrogative complaint, "Why did you go in etc.?" followed by an answer of Peter. This was certainly the understanding of Chrysostom. In his Homilies on Acts, 25. (Montfaucon ix. 193) he explains ὅτι . . . εἰσῆλθες καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς thus οὐ λέγουσι διατί κατήγγειλας; ἀλλά, διατί συνέφαγες; Failure to observe this idiom led to the reading in the third person in Codex Vaticanus and a few others (cf. Ropes, *Text of Acts, ad loc.*) and to the conjecture of τί by Boyss. In the gospels, Mark 2 16 and parallels show an interrogative in a like complaint against Jesus and these parallels all suggest a like construction in two[25] similar passages in the third Gospel: Luke 15 2, καὶ ὑμῖν. C. H. Turner in a full study in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxvii (1925), pp. 58ff., accepts ὅτι as a direct interrogative in Mark 2 7 (BΘ); 2 16 (BL 33); 8 12 (C Origen); 9 11; 9 28, in Hermas, Sim ii. 10; v. 6, 4; viii. 1, 4 (*P Mich*), viii. 6, 2 (*P Mich*) and, following Tischendorf, at Barnabas vii. 9; viii. 5; x. 1. In some of the patristic instances it is probably an indirect interrogative.

[25] Note διεγόγγυζον in both, like ἐγόγγυζον of Luke 5 30. The verb διεκρίνοντο of Acts 11 2 finds a parallel in the Western text of Luke 11 38 (another case of violation of Pharisaic food restrictions): ἤρξατο διακρινόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγειν διὰ τί (the Neutral text is simply ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασεν ὅτι) οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου. In a similar complaint at Mark 2 6, we have διαλογιζόμενοι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν ὅτι οὗτος λαλεῖ; βλασφημεῖ according to BΘ; the other MSS. read τί for ὅτι and many add οὕτως.

διεγόγγυζον οἵ τε Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς λέγοντες ὅτι οὗτος ἁμαρτωλοὺς προσδέχεται καὶ συνεσθίει αὐτοῖς, and Luke 19 7, καὶ ἰδόντες πάντες διεγόγγυζον λέγοντες ὅτι παρὰ ἁμαρτωλῷ ἀνδρὶ εἰσῆλθεν καταλῦσαι.

As the idiom is confirmed for Mark by the paraphrase of Matthew and Luke ("the earliest commentators"[26]), so it is in a sense confirmed for Luke-Acts by the old Latin version which is the first commentator on that work.[27] At Acts 11 3 *quare* is read by most MSS. and at Luke 15 2 by Codex Vercellensis. Of course *quare* like ὅτι may be indirect as well as direct interrogative. It must suffice here to open the question concerning these and possibly other instances[28] of ὅτι = 'why' in direct question in the writings of Luke.

[26] A. T. Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek N. T.*[3], 1919, p. 1421.

[27] Turner, *loc. cit.* shows how frequently the Latin translations find interrogatives in the Greek ὅτι, but he appeals to none of the Lucan instances.

[28] Other possible cases in Luke-Acts would include Luke 1 25 (ὅτι οὕτως as in Mark 2 7, see old Latin); 11 38 (see note 25; variant of D and Latin); Acts 18 13.

BOOKS RECEIVED

A New Commentary on Holy Scripture. Including the Apocrypha. Edited by Charles Gore, H. L. Goudge and A. Guillaume. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1928. Pp. XV + 697 + 158 + 743. $ 5.—.

Personal Names of Cappadocia. (Yale Oriental Series, Researches, Vol. XIII, Part. I). By Ferris J. Stephens. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1928. Pp. XI + 98. $ 3.—.

Jeremiah. His Time and his Work. By Adam C. Welch. New York: Oxford University Press, 1928. Pp. 263. $ 2.50.

The Genesis of the Social Gospel. The Meaning of the Ideals of Jesus in the Light of their Antecedents. By Chester Charlton McCown. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1929. Pp. XIII + 394 + XVII. $ 3.25.

Religion and the New Testament. By R. H. Malden. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1928. Pp. XIII + 204. $ 2.50.

The Parables of Jesus. By Willard H. Robinson. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928. Pp. 222. $ 2.—.

Materialien zum islamischen und jüdischen Eherecht. (Arbeiten aus dem Orientalischen Seminar der Universität Giessen, 1. Heft). By Samuel Bialoblocki. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1928. Pp. 54. M. 3.50.

Vulgatastudien. Die Evangelien der Vulgata untersucht auf ihre lateinische und griechische Vorlage (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, XIV. Band, 2.—3. Heft). By Heinrich Joseph Vogels. Münster i. W.: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928. Pp. V + 345. M. 13.35.

Die äthiopische Übersetzung des Propheten Daniel. By Oscar Löfgren. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1927. Pp. LIV + 163 + IV facsimiles. Fr. 150.

Synoptische Studien. Erstes Heft: Zur Geschichtsquelle. By Wilhelm Bussmann. Halle a. S.: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1925. Pp. VIII + 240. M. 15.—.

Reallexikon der Assyriologie. 1. Band, 2. Lieferung (Altkleinasiatische Völker—Arwad). Edited by Erich Ebeling and Bruno Meissner. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1929. Pp. 81—160 + Tafel 15—22. M. 7.—.

Die vorchristliche und frühchristliche Zeit des Paulus. Nach seinen geschichtlichen und geographischen Selbstzeugnissen im Galaterbrief

(Forschungen zur Entstehung des Urchristentums des Neuen Testaments und der Kirche). By Ernst Barnikol. Kiel: Walter G. Mühlau Verlag, 1929. Pp. 94. M. 3.50.

Die Bedeutung der Geschichte für die Verständigung des Amos und Hosea. By Julius Rieger. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1929. Pp. VIII + 116. M. 3.75.

Die Landschaft Babylonien im Zeitalter des Talmuds und des Gaonats (Schriften der Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaft des Judentums, No. 30). By Jacob Obermeyer. Frankfurt a. M.: I. Kauffmann Verlag, 1929. Pp. VIII + 362. M. 16 (geb. M. 18).

Die Allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandreia. (Beiheft zur ZATW, No. 51). By Edmund Stein. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1929. Pp. 61. M. 3.20.

Geschichte des Volkes Israel. 3. Band: Die Zeit der Wegführung nach Babel and die Aufrichtung der neuen Gemeinde. 2. Hälfte. By Rud. Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1929. Pp. XII + 299—761. M. 13.60.

This section of Professor Kittel's important and monumental History is dedicated to our SOCIETY "als Dank für die Ernennung zum Ehrenmitglied."

Le Poème de Job. Traduction Nouvelle, Introduction et Notes (Judaïsme). By Paul Bertie. Paris: Les Éditions Rieder, 1929. Pp. 200. Fr. 12.

La Bible de Reuss et la Renaissance des Études d'Histoire Religieuse en France. By A. Causse. Paris: Librairie Felix Alcan, 1929. Pp. 41.

Les Dispersés D'Israël. Les Origines de la Diaspora et son Rôle dans la Formation du Judaïsme. By A. Causse. Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan, 1929. Pp. 166. Fr. 20.

L'Origine du Code Deuteronomique. Examen historique et littéraire du sujet à la lumière de la critique contemporaine. By Arthur Robert Siebens. (Fellow of Mc Cormick Theol. Sem.) Paris: Librairie Ernest Leroux, 1929. Pp. 256. Fr. 25.—.

Nabonidus and Belshazzar. A Study of the Closing Events of the Neo-Babylonian Empire (Yale Oriental Series, Researches, Vol. XV). By Raymond Philpp Dougherty. New Haven: Yale University Press 1929. Pp. XII + 216. $ 3.—

A careful aud scholarly study of all relevant material, old and new, making an extremely important contribution to the understanding of this important period.

The Book of Proverbs. With Introduction and Notes. By W. O. E. Oesterley. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1929. Pp. LXXXVII + 294. $ 6.—.

The Tittled Bible. A Model Codex of the Pentateuch. By Moses Gaster. London: Maggs Bros., 1929. £ 25.—.

Contains 438 facsimile pages from the Manuscript.

PROCEEDINGS

DECEMBER 27th and 28th, 1928

THE sixty-fourth meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis was called to order by President L. W. Batten at 10:30 A. M. on December 27th, 1928 at the Biblical Seminary in New York, 235 East 49th Street.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and approved. The reports of the Corresponding Secretary and of the Recording Secretary were read and ordered to be filed. The report of the Treasurer was read. To audit it Professors Montgomery, Look, and Obermann were appointed. To nominate officers for the coming year Professors Barton, Arnold, and Goodspeed were appointed. After a brief announcement by the committee on arrangements the following papers were read and discussed:

By Julian Obermann: The "Speaking" Oracle of Isaiah 21 1–10.
By J. A. Maynard: Who was the beloved disciple?
By S. Zeitlin: The Christian Passages in the Slavonic Josephus.
The Rockefeller-McCormick New Testament.
By E. J. Goodspeed: I. The Discovery of the Paleologus Codex.
By H. R. Willoughby: II. The Iconography of the Paleologus Codex.
By D. W. Riddle: III. The Text of the Paleologus Codex.
Colored Lantern Slides of the MS.

Thursday afternoon, December 27. The Society reconvened about 2:20. The President, Professor L. W. Batten, read the presidential address upon "Hosea's Message and Marriage." Other papers were read and discussed as follows:

By F. M. Crouch: Some Recent Theories Concerning the Date of the Last Supper.
By G. A. Barton: The Habiri of the El-Amarna Tablets and the Hebrew Conquest of Palestine.

By G. A. Barton: The Question of an Ur-Marcus Once More.
By B. A. Elzas: Isaiah 51 20 with reference to the Targum and LXX.
By B. A. Elzas: I Samuel 10 12.
By F. G. Bratton: Continuity and Divergence in the Jesus-Paul Problem.
By T. J. Meek: Some Emendations in the Old Testament.
By H. S. Gehman: Hesychian Influence in the Versions of Daniel.
By A. M. Perry: Some Sections of Oral Tradition in Luke.
By H. L. Gordon: The Antiquity of the Modern Cursive Hebrew Script.

Thursday Evening, December 27. The Society convened at 8 p. m. The session was held as a meeting of the Fund for Biblical and Oriental Archaeological Research, with Professor Montgomery in the chair. The following papers were presented:

By W. J. Moulton: The American Schools of Oriental Research (Representative's Report).
By E. A. Speiser: Pre-Assyrian Assyria (illustrated).
By Elihu Grant: Beth Shemesh Excavations, 1928.

Friday Morning, December 28. The Society met at 9:30 a. m. The auditors made report that they had examined the Treasurer's statement and books for the year and had found them correct. The nominating committee made the following suggestions which were approved and the persons named appointed for the year 1929, viz.:

Prof. J. E. Frame	*President*
Dean W. F. Badé	*Vice-President*
Prof. Millar Burrows	*Treasurer*
Prof. H. J. Cadbury	*Recording Secretary*
Prof. H. C. Alleman Prof. Moses Bailey Prof. H. S. Gehman Prof. E. Olive Dutcher Prof. Solomon Zeitlin	*Associates in Council*
Pres. W. J. Moulton	*Representative of the Society on the Board of Trustees of the American Schools of Oriental Research.*

The report of the Council was made by the Recording Secretary and was approved. The persons nominated by the Council and some others were elected as active members. Professor Alfred Bertholet of the University of Berlin was elected an honorary

member. At the suggestion of the Council it was voted to fix the next meeting for December 30 and 31, 1929, to begin at 10:30 on Monday. The place of meeting was left to the Council to decide. Greetings from the so-called Columbiona Group who were meeting in the same building were received, and like greetings were returned to them. President W. W. White of the Biblical Seminary in New York extended to the Society the welcome of the Seminary. The Society tendered to our hosts a vote of thanks. The following Symposium on the relation between primitive Christianity and Judaism. having been arranged by Professors Bacon and Porter. occupied the remainder of the session:

By F. C. Porter: The Problem of Things New and Old in the Beginnings of Christianity.

By C. C. Torrey: The Influence of Second Isaiah in the Gospels and Acts.

By J. H. Ropes: The Influence of Second Isaiah on the Epistles.

By B. W. Bacon: Jesus in Relation to the Baptist.

By S. S. Cohon: The Place of Jesus in the Religious Life of His Day.

By E. F. Scott: The Originality of the Ethical Teaching of Jesus.

Friday Afternoon, December 28. The Society convened at 2 p. m. The following memorial minute prepared by Professor Bewer at the request of the Council was adopted:

> The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis records with sorrow the death of its honorary member, Professor Bernhard Duhm, who at the end of August this year was killed by an automobile in the streets of Basle.
>
> Professor Duhm was one of the foremost Old Testament scholars of our age. Already his earliest work on *Die Theologie der Propheten* took very high rank, and his later contributions, especially on Isaiah in Nowack's *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament* and Jeremiah in Marti's *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament*, were nothing short of epoch-making. His books are too well known and too much used to need detailed mention. His striking originality, his deep insight, his great learning enriched especially by his masteyr of the history of religions and by his unusual power of *Einfühlung*, and his discriminating appreciation made his writings truly great. The mark of genius was upon them all, even upon his occasional pamphlets, some of which like *Das Geheimnis der Religion* or *Das Kommende Reich Gottes* belong to the finest that has been written on the subject. The distinction, clarity, and beauty of his style enhanced the value of all he wrote.

Professor Duhm was also a great teacher. In his lecture room he exerted a fascination upon his students which they never could resist and ever will remember. Calm, serene, genial, he was always luminous, sometimes sparkling with wit and humor, sometimes serious to awe-inspiring solemnity; severe in his critical standards and requirements, yet kind and helpful without limit to those who specialized with him.

Behind all that Professor Duhm wrote and taught there was a great personality. The profoundly spiritual and moral quality of his nature, and the brilliant originality of his intellect grew to real greatness by his deep meditations in which he scorned, perhaps too much, the work of other thinkers, but as a result of which he made his lasting contributions to research.

Conscious of its own loss, the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis desires to express its genuine sympathy to Professor Duhm's family and to the University of Basle in their bereavement.

A vote of thanks was passed to those who had prepared and taken part in the interesting symposium of the morning session. The Society divided into two sections. In the Old Testament section the following papers were presented:

By E. A. Speiser: Biblical Echoes from Mesopotamia.
By George Dahl: Recent Interpretations of Second Isaiah.
By E. G. Kraeling: The Interpretation of the name "Noah" in Genesis 5 29.
By A. J. Culler: Comparative Religious Literature: a Study in Method.
By Fleming James: Teaching Israel's Religion by the Case Method.
By T. J. Meek: The Translation of יום אחד in Genesis 1 5.

In the New Testament Section the following papers were read and discussed:

By S. V. McCasland: The Scripture Basis of "on the third day."
By Elbert Russell: The Johns of the Fourth Gospel.
By Silva New: The Text of Matthew Used by Origen and Eusebius.
By James Moffatt: The Interpretation of Romans 6 17–18.
By C. H. Kraeling: *Martyrium Jesu*: Mark's Narrative of the Passion.
By Millar Burrows: Mark's Transitions and the Translation Hypothesis.
By Ralph Marcus: Philo's Divine Comedy.
By E. J. Goodspeed: Acts, Ephesians and the Pauline Corpus.

The following papers were read by title:

By M. L. Margolis: Masoretic and Pre-masoretic.
By J. A. Montgomery: Ethiopic Texts of Acts.

By R. P. Dougherty: The Idiom "lift up the head" in Hebrew and Babylonian Usage.
By Kemper Fullerton: The Strophe in Hebrew Poetry and Psalm 29.
By H. C. York: Sociological Interpretation of the Decalogue.
By W. T. McCree: Cult of the Ark.
By L. I. Newman: Biblical Texts in the Apologetical Writings of Joseph and David Kimchi.
By H. S. Gehman: The Armenian Version of the Books of Kings.

Adjourned at 5:30 p. m.

HENRY J. CADBURY, *Recording Secretary.*

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY

The 1928 volume (XLVII) of the Journal has been published during the year. Following recent custom, it has appeared in two numbers instead of the more desirable four. The reason for this lies in the difficulties and added expense incident to quarterly publication abroad.

It has seemed wise to the Editors to feature at least one Symposium each year. In this way there results a certain unity for part of the yearly meeting of the Society as well as in the Journal itself. Suggestions as to appropriate Symposium topics and participants will be accorded a hearty welcome.

It is a pleasure to transmit to the members of this Society cordial greetings from two of our honorary members, Professors Karl Budde of Marburg and Gustav Dalman of Greifswald.

The Journal stands as a bulwark of American Biblical scholarship and, to a real degree, as its index. It provides a channel through which creative thought may find expression. It is of the utmost importance that the challenge it offers be taken up by qualified members of the Society.

Respectfully submitted,

GEORGE DAHL, *Corresponding Secretary.*

December 27, 1928.

REPORT OF THE RECORDING SECRETARY

The active members of the Society appear to number at present 412, which is an increase of 3 over the number reported last year (409). 23 new members nominated and elected a year ago have joined the Society.

Our honorary member, Professor Bernhard Duhm, of Basle, was killed by an automobile on August 31, 1928.

The deaths of the following members have been reported:

I. M. Casanowicz, National Museum, Washington, D. C., on September 26, 1927

Professor E. Y. Hincks, Cambridge, Mass., on Dec. 28, 1927

Professor H. B. Carré, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., on January 30, 1928

Professor Walter M. Patton, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., on August 5, 1928

Professor P. V. Roberts, Baker University, Baldwin, Kans., on October 27, 1928

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY J. CADBURY. *Recording Secretary.*

December 27, 1928.

TREASURER'S REPORT FOR 1928

Receipts

Balance forward	$ 3059.05
Dues	1193.70
Reprints and extra printing expense	63.80
Interest	7.68
Yale Press	480.31
Total	$ 4804.54

Disbursements

Offizin Drugulin	$ 1784.12
J. C. Winston Co.	22.50
Editorial expenses	116.05
Secretary's expenses	17.27
Postage, stationery, & printing	30.72
Clerical service	31.64
Refund for overpayment	4.00
Exchange	—.60
Member's check returned	6.—
	$ 2012.90
Balance	2791.64
	$ 4804.54

Distribution of Balance:

Rhode Island Hospital Trust Co.	$ 626.64
New First National Bank, Meadville, Pa.	2150.—
Undeposited checks	15.—
	$ 2791.64

The above account, covering transactions to date, is respectfully submitted.

MILLAR BURROWS, *Treasurer*

December 24, 1928

Audited and found correct

A. E. LOOK,
RALPH MARCUS,
Auditing Committee

December 27, 1928

MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY[1]

HONORARY MEMBERS

Prof. A. Bertholet, D. Theol., Preußenallee 36, Charlottenburg 9, Berlin, Germany.
Prof. K. Budde, D. D., Marburg, Germany.
Prof. F. C. Burkitt, M. A., Cambridge, England.
Prof. Gustav Dalman, Theol. D., Greifswald, Germany.
Prof. Ernst von Dobschütz, D. D., Halle, Germany.
Prof. Hermann Gunkel, D. Theol., Halle, Germany.
Prof. Adolf von Harnack, D. D., Berlin, Germany.
Prof. A. Jülicher, D. D., Marburg, Germany.
Prof. Rudolf Kittel, D. D., Leipzig, Germany, Rosenthalgasse 13.
Prof. Marie Joseph Lagrange, Jerusalem (care of M. Gabalda, 90 Rue Bonaparte, Paris).
Prof. A. H. Sayce, D. D., Oxford, England.
Prof. G. A. Smith, D. D., Aberdeen, Scotland.

ACTIVE MEMBERS[2]

(693) '22 Rev. G. Abbott-Smith, D. D., D. C. L., 3475 University St., Montreal, Canada.
(593) '20 Prof. Arthur Adams, Ph. D., Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.
(242) '92 Pres. Cyrus Adler, Ph. D., 2041 North Broad St., Phila., Pa.
(731) '22 Rev. Abel Ahlquist, 19 Bassett St., New Britain, Conn.
(576) '17 Wm. Foxwell Albright, Ph. D., Johns Hotkins Univ., Baltimore, Md.
(466) '11 Prof. Herbert C. Alleman, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.
(415) '07 Prof. Fredereck L. Anderson, D. D., Newton Centre, Mass.
(934) '29 Miss Mary E. Andrews, A. M., B. D., 2217 Calvert St., Baltimore, Md.
(711) '22 Rev. Prof. S. Angus, Ph. D., St. Andrew's College, Sydney, Australia.

[1] This list has been corrected up to October 1, 1929. Members are requested to notify the Recording Secretary, H. J. Cadbury, Bryn Mawr, Pa., of any change of address.
[2] The two numbers prefixed to the name of each member indicate the order and date of his accession to membership in the Society.

(305) '96 Prof. Wm. R. Arnold, Ph. D., 17 Francis Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
(724) '22 Prof. J. C. Ayer, 200 St. Mark's Sqr., Philadelphia, Pa.
(901) '28 Rev. Otto J. Baab, M. A., 5815 Drexel Ave., Chicago, Ill.
(925) '29 Miss Mary Lowrey Babcock, 439 W. 123rd St., N. Y. City.
(184) '88 Prof. B. W. Bacon, D. D., 244 Edwards St., New Haven, Conn.
(373) '04 Dean Wm. Frederic Badé, Ph. D., D. D., Litt. D., Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal.
(926) '29 Prof. John William Bailey, Ph. D., 2206 Dwight Way, Berkeley, Calif.
(690) '22 Prof. Moses Bailey, Ph. D., 6 Norfolk Terrace, Wellesley, Mass.
(712) '21 Lieut. C. C. Baker, 719 National City Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.
(722) '22 Prof. J. F. Balzer, M. A., Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.
(825) '26 Albert E. Barnett, 1032 18th Ave. S., Nashville, Tenn.
(210) '91 Prof. George A. Barton, Ph. D., N. E. Cor. 43rd and Spruce Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
(927) '29 Prof. Salo Baron, 40 West 68th St., N. Y. City.
(211) '91 Prof. L. W. Batten, Ph. D., 6 Chelsea Sq., N. Y. City.
(902) '28 Prof. H. M. Battenhouse, Albion College, Albion, Mich.
(561) '16 Prof. John W. Beardslee, Jr., Ph. D., D. D., Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.
(828) '26 Prof. Dwight M. Beck, S. T. B., Mt. Union College, Alliance, Ohio.
(694) '22 Prof. Irwin R. Beiler, Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa.
(829) '26 Miss Marion J. Benedict, Ph. D., Sweetbriar College, Sweetbriar, Va.
(718) '22 Rev. C. D. Benjamin, Ph. D., Somerton, Philadelphia, Pa.
(568) '16 Rev. C. Theodore Benze, Lutheran Seminary, Mt. Airy, Pa.
(830) '26 Rev. J. Buchanan Bernardin, B. D., 600 W. 122nd St., N. Y. City.
(326) '99 Prof. George R. Berry, D. D., Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y.
(318) '98 Prof. Julius A. Bewer, Ph. D., D. D., Union Theol. Sem., N. Y. City.
(963) '29 Prof. Andrew W. Blackwood, D. D., Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
(618) '21 Pres. James A. Blaisdell, Pomona College, Claremont, Cal.
(551) '15 Rev. Joshua Bloch, Ph. D., 476 Fifth Ave., N. Y. City.
(751) '23 Father A. M. Bolduc, S. M., S. T. L. Left no address.
(843) '26 F. D. Bone, Box 17, McMurry College, Abilene, Texas.
(928) '29 Rev. Osborne Booth, B. A., B. D., Beacon Falls, Conn.
(795) '25 Prof. Clarence Bouma, A. M., Th. D., Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich.
(887) '27 Rev. Boone M. Bowen, Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn.
(423) '08 Prof. Clayton R. Bowen, Th. D., 5657 Woodlawn Ave., Chicago, Ill.

(370) '03 Rev. Lester Bradner, Ph. D., 413 Lloyd Avenue, Providence, R. I.
(929) '29 Rev. Wm. M. Bradner, B. D., 1 Joy St., Boston, Mass.
(903) '28 Prof. Harvie Branscomb, Duke University, Durham, N. C.
(930) '29 Fred G. Bratton, Ph. D., Islington, Mass.
(931) '29 Mr. Baruch Braunstein, 640 Ft. Washington Av., N. Y. City.
(311) '97 Miss Emilie Grace Briggs, Hotel Holley, Washington Square West, New York City.
(831) '26 Rev. Mitchell Bronk, D. D., 1701 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
(569) '16 Mrs. Beatrice A. Brooks, Ph. D., Wellesley, Mass.
(870) '27 W. Rolfe Brown, Johannesstift, Artilleriestraße 15, Berlin N. 24, Germany.
(719) '22 Prof. Walter E. Bundy, Ph. D., De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.
(586) '18 Prof. Ernest Ward Burch, Ph. D., Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
(747) '23 Prof. Millar Burrows, B. D., Ph. D., Brown University, Providence, R. I.
(554) '15 Prof. R. Butin, S. M., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
(950) '29 Rev. Frank E. Butler, 20 Everett Av., Providence, R. I.
(689) '18 Prof. Moses Buttenwieser, Ph. D., 252 Loraine Ave., Clifton, Cincinnati, O.
(471) '11 Prof. Henry J. Cadbury, Ph. D., Bryn Mawr, Pa.
(904) '28 Prof. J. Y. Campbell, 2116 Edwards Hall, New Haven, Conn.
(631) '21 Rev. James T. Carlyon, S.T.M., D.D., Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Col.
(784) '24 Mr. L. L. Carpenter, B. A., Th. D., 714 Augusta St., Greenville, S. C.
(821) '25 Prof. J. F. B. Carruthers, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Calif.
(951) '29 Miss Mabel R. Carter, Hollins College, Hollins, Va.
(392) '06 Prof. Shirley J. Case, Ph. D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(964) '29 M. L. Dassady, 531. W. 122nd. St., N. Y. City.
(933) '29 Thomas Phelps Chalker, B. A., B. D., 78 Pearl St., New Haven, Conn.
(222) '91 Rev. James L. Cheney, Ph. D., 1845 Roxford Road, E. Cleveland, Ohio.
(595) '20 Prof. Edward Chiera, Ph. D., Oriental Museum, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
(896) '27 Rev. Elmer B. Christie, B. D., The Vicarage, Okanogan, Wash.
(369) '03 Prof. Calvin M. Clark, Bangor Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.
(932) '29 Rev. G. A. Clarke, 276 Ryerson St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
(523) '14 C. P. Coffin, 2304 Park Place, Evanston, Ill.
(606) '20 Rabbi Simon Cohen, Temple Emanu-el, 1 E. 65th St., N. Y. City.

(686) '22 Rabbi Simon R. Cohen, 75 Prospect Park West, Brooklyn. N. Y.
(935) '29 Prof. Samuel S. Cohon, A. B., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, O.
(899) '27 Harry Comins, 1605 Fulton Avenue, New York, City.
(662) '22 David C. Cook, Elgin, Ill.
(615) '21 Rev. Francis T. Cooke, 31 Maple St., Bristol, Conn.
(582) '18 Rev. George S. Cooke, Wissahickon Inn, Redlands, Calif.
(936) '29 Miss Virginia Corwin, 787 Vose Ave., Orange, N. J.
(937) '29 Prof. Clarence T. Craig, Ph. D., D. D., Oberlin, Ohio.
(390) '06 Rev. Wm. M. Crane, Ph. D., Richmond, Mass.
(296) '96 Prof. Harlan Creelman, Ph. D., 118 North St., Auburn, N. Y.
(796) '25 Rev. Margaret B. Crook, 11 Jewett St., Northampton, Mass.
(759) '24 Prof. Earle B. Cross, Ph. D., 136 Harvard St., Rochester, N. Y.
(905) '28 Rev. Frank Monroe Crouch, 652 W. 189th St., New York City.
(819) '25 Prof. A. J. Culler, B. D., Ph. D., Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio.
(498) '13 Prof. D. E. Culley, Ph. D., 57 Belvidere St., Crafton, Pittsburgh, Pa.
(832) '26 A. Bruce Curry, Ph. D., Union Theol. Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., N. Y. City.
(739) '23 Prof. Muriel Streibert Curtis, B. D., Wellesley, Mass.
(401) '07 Prof. Elizabeth Czarnomska, Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va.
(499) '13 Prof. Geo. Dahl, Ph. D., c. o. Brown, Shipley & Co., 123 Pall Mall, London, England.
(797) '25 Prof. H. E. Dana, Th. D., Seminary Hill, Texas.
(645) '21 Miss Clara W. Davidson, Pleasantville, Venango Co., Pa.
(526) '15 Prof. Israel Davidson, 531 W. 123 St., N. Y. City.
(451) '10 Prof. Richard Davidson, Ph. D., 75 Queen's Park, Toronto, Can.
(705) '22 M. E. Davis, Th. M., D. D., Box 178, Brownwood, Tex.
(906) '28 Rev. Edward Day, Duncan Field Library, San Antonio, Tex.
(500) '13 Prof. Frank Leighton Day, Ashland, Va.
(458) '10 Prof. Thomas F. Day, 1648 S. A. Ave., San Anselmo, Calif.
(633) '21 Prof. John Pitt Deane, M. A., Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
(524) '14 Dean Irwin Hoch DeLong, Ph. D., 523 West James St., Lancaster, Pa.
(121) '84 Prof. F. B. Denio, D. D., Bangor, Me.
(817) '25 Prof. W. B. Denny, 143 Seventh Ave., North, Troy, N. Y.
(723) '22 Prof. H. T. De Wolfe, D. D., Acadia Univ., Wolfville, N. S., Canada.
(619) '21 Rev. Prof. Charles Allen Dinsmore, 10 Old Hartford Turnpike, New Haven, Conn.
(417) '07 Prof. Winfred N. Donovan, Newton Centre, Mass.
(596) '20 Prof. R. P. Dougherty, 319 Willow St., New Haven, Conn.
(823) '26 Prof. C. C. Douglas, Ph. D., 902 W. 37th St., Los Angeles, Calif.

(833) '26 Rev. Prof. John Dow, M. A., 75 Queen's Park, Toronto, Can.
(634) '22 Rev. Benj. R. Downer, Th. D., 1043 Laurel Ave., Kansas City, Kansas.
(664) '22 Rev. George H. Driver, 229 Eliot St., Milton, Mass.
(872) '27 Rev. Anson M. DuBois, M. A., Th. M., 32 Paul Revere Road, Arlington Heights, Mass.
(620) '21 Prof. William Haskell Dubose, University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.
(760) '24 Prof. George S. Duncan, 2900 Seventh St., N. E., Washington, D. C.
(938) '29 Prof. Marion H. Dunsmore, Ph. D., Hiram, Ohio.
(382) '05 Prof. E. Olive Dutcher, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
(666) '21 Rev. Frank Eakin, Ph. D., Vineland, N. J.
(402) '07 Prof. Burton S. Easton, Ph. D., 4 Chelsea Sq., New York City.
(844) '26 Miss Louise Eby, B. D., 99 Claremont Ave., New York City, N.Y.
(898) '27 Rev. Frank L. Edwards, B. D., Brookfield Center, Conn.
(888) '27 Dean G. D. Edwards, A. M., Columbia, Mo.
(364) '03 Dean F. C. Eiselen, Garrett Bibl. Inst., Evanston, Ill.
(673) '22 Israel Eitan, 270 N. Craig St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
(612) '21 Rev. Barnett A. Elzas, A. B., M. D., LL. D., 42 W. 72nd St., New York.
(761) '24 Rabbi H. G. Enelow, D. D., 521 Fifth Ave., Cincinnati, O.
(745) '23 Prof. Morton Scott Enslin, Th. D., 4 Seminary Ave., Chester, Pa.
(263) '94 Pres. Milton G. Evans, D. D., Crozer Theol. Sem., Chester, Pa.
(799) '25 Prof. H. R. Fairclough, Ph. D., Litt. D., 1005 Bryant St., Palo Alto, Calif.
(800) '25 David E. Faust, B. D., Catawba College, Salisbury, N. C.
(753) '23 S. Feigin, 135 S. Aiken Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa.
(939) '29 Rabbi Abraham J. Feldmann, 145 Ballard Drive, West Hartfort, Ct.
(735) '23 Pres. Carl A. Felt, The Peking Theol. Sem., Peking, China.
(862) '26 Floyd V. Filson, 2330 N. Halsted St., Chicago, Ill.
(762) '24 Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, 531 W. 123rd St., N. Y City.
(873) '27 Prof. Elmer E. Flack, Th. D., 503 E. McCreight Ave., Springfield, Ohio.
(763) '24 Rev. John W. Flight, Ph. D., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
(578) '17 Rev. Robert B. B. Foote, East Norwalk, Conn.
(874) '27 Bliss Forbush, Park Ave. and Laurens St., Baltimore, Md.
(629) '21 Rev. Donald F. Forrester, B. D., Ph. D., 175 Ninth Ave., N. Y. City.
(441) '08 Dean H. E. W. Fosbroke, General Theological Seminary, Ninth Ave. & 20th St., New York City.

(587) '18 Rabbi Solomon Foster, B. A., 90 Treacy St., Newark, N. J.
(875) '27 Prof. William M. Fouts, Th. D., 3040 W. Washington Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
(298) '96 Prof. Henry T. Fowler, Ph. D., Brown Univ., Providence, R. I.
(814) '25 Rabbi Leon Fram, Congregation Beth El, Woodward at Gladstone, Detroit ,Mich.
(312) '97 Prof. James E. Frame, Union Theol. Sem., N. Y. City.
(418) '07 Prof. D. J. Fraser, Presbyterian College, Montreal, Can.
(671) '22 Rabbi Samuel Fredman, 6046 Washington Ave, .Philadelphia, Pa.
(789) '24 Miss Estelle Freeman, Central Presbyterian Church, N. Y. City.
(752) '23 W. W. Freeman, Th. M., State Teachers College, Commerce, Texas.
(541) '15 Prof. Leslie E. Fuller, Ph. D., Garrett Bibl. Inst., Evanston, Ill.
(366) '03 Prof. Kemper Fullerton, Oberlin Theol. Sem., Oberlin, O.
(764) '24 Prof. Frank Gavin, Th. D., General Theol.Sem., N. Y. City.
(765) '24 Henry S. Gehman, Ph. D., S. T. D., Princeton Univ., Princeton, N. J.
(889) '27 Miss Katy Boyd George, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
(750) '23 Rev. Ralph William George, S. T. B., 48 Flint St., Somerville, Mass.
(876) '27 Prof. W. C. Gibbs, B. D., Columbia, Mo.
(198) '89 Prof. George W. Gilmore, 354 Fourth Ave., N. Y. City.
(965) '29 MacLean Gilmour, Markt 9 III bei Michaeli, Marburg, Germany.
(766) '24 Prof. Louis Ginzberg, Ph. D., 531 W. 123rd St., N. Y. City.
(801) '25 Rev. C. E. Goddard, Ph. D., Independence, Mo.
(907) '28 Miss Beatrice L. Goff, A. B., 15 Leighton Road, Wellesley, Mass.
(866) '27 Rabbi Israel Goldstein, M. A., 233 W. 83rd St., New York City.
(794) '24 Rev. E. R. Goodenough, D. Phil., Woodbridge, New Haven, Conn.
(340) '00 Prof. Edgar J. Goodspeed, Ph. D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(447) '09 Prof. Alex. R. Gordon, Litt. D., Prebyterian College, Montreal, Can.
(940) '29 Mr. Cyrus H. Gordon, M. A., 6026 Carpenter St., Philadelphia.
(867) '27 Supt. Hirsch L. Gordon, Ph. D., L. H. D.,, 131 Johnson Ave., Newark, N. J.
(162) '86 Prof. R. J. H. Gottheil, Ph. D., Columbia Univ., N. Y. City.
(635) '21 Prof. William C. Graham, S. T. M., Faculty Exchange, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(384) '05 Prof. Elihu Grant, Ph. D., Box 333, Jerusalem, Palestine.
(621) '21 Dean Frederick C. Grant, S. T. D., 2145 Orrington Ave., Evanston, Ill.
(678) '22 Rev. Oscar F. Green, P. O. Box 322, Palo Alto, Calif.

(877) '27 Rev. Caspar R. Gregory, Auburn Theol. Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.
(941) '29 William A. Haggerty, Ph. D., Arlington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
(646) '21 Rev. Frank H. Hallock, D. D., Buffalo, Wyo.
(923) '28 Prof. E. E. Harkness, B. D., Ph. D., Crozer Seminary, Chester, Pa.
(728) '22 Victor E. Harlow, M. A., Oklahoma City, Okla.
(818) '25 Rev. F. D. Harris, 2138 Central Ave, Detroit, Mich.
(119) '84 Prof. J. R. Harris, Litt. D., 210 Bristol Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham, England.
(834) '26 Rev. R. S. Haupert, Moravian College and Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa.
(668) '22 Prof. Charles A. Hawley, Ph. D., Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
(648) '21 Prof. Howell M. Haydn, B. D., 1832 Rosemont Road, East Cleveland, Ohio.
(322) '98 Rev. Henry H. Haynes, Ph. D., Derry Village, N. H.
(960) '29 Prof. George Percy Hedley, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif.
(503) '13 Prof. Charles B. Hedrick, 599 Whitney Ave., New Haven, Conn.
(124) '84 Rev. C. R. Hemphill, D. D., Louisville, Ky.
(577) '17 Prof. Ralph K. Hickok, Wells College, Aurora, N. Y.
(890) '27 Prof. J. H. Hicks, A. B.,B. D., 3548 Roberts Ave., Dallas, Tex.
(454) '10 Prof. W. Bancroft Hill, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
(434) '08 Prof. Wm. J. Hinke, Ph. D., 156 North St., Auburn, N. Y.
(659) '21 Rev. Chas. T. Hock, 222 Liberty St., Bloomfield, N. J.
(802) '25 Rev. Ernest G. Hoff, Ph. D., 22 S. State St., Elgin, Ill.
(563) '16 Rev. Louis H. Holden, Ph. D., Bishop Place, New Brunswick, N. J.
(836) '26 Miss Louise P. Holden, Stuart Hall, Staunton, Va.
(427) '08 Rev. Ivan L. Holt, 5068 Washington Blvd., St. Louis, Mo.
(539) '15 Prof. Lynn H. Hough, Central M. E. Church, Detroit, Mich.
(942) '25 Prof. J. Howard Howson, M. A., Ph. D., Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.
(304) '96 Rt. Rev. Hiram R. Hulse, S. T. D., 15th and 8th Sts., Havana, Cuba.
(439) '08 Prof. Mary I. Hussey, Morgan Road, South Hadley, Mass.
(943) '29 Prof. Oliver W. Hutchinson, S. T. B., Ph. D., 505 Univ. Av., Rochester, N. Y.
(452) '10 Prof. Henri Hyvernat, Catholic University, Washinton, D. C.
(858) '26 Dean Clyo Jackson, St. Stephen's College, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.
(559) '16 Prof. F. J. Foakes Jackson, Union Theol. Sem., N. Y. City.

(679) '22 Prof. Fleming James, Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.
(891) '27 Dr. George Jeshurun, 1366 55th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
(386) '05 Prof. James R. Jewett, Ph. D., 44 Francis Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
(864) '27 Clarence Richard Johnson, 2921 1/2 S. Hoover St., Los Angeles, Calif.
(485) '12 Miss Harriet E. Johnson, 32 Chestnut St., Boston, Mass.
(636) '21 Pres. William H. Johnson, Ph. D., D. D., Lincoln University, Pa.
(962) '29 Rabbi Leo Jung, Ph. D., 131 W. 86th St., N. Y. City.
(865) '27 Prof. M. M. Kaplan, 1 W. 89th St., New York City.
(878) '27 Rev. Francis L. Keenan, St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass.
(850) '26 Mrs. Doris Trevett Keller, 46 Arlington St., E. Orange, N. J.
(151) '86 Prof. M. L. Kellner, D. D., 3 Concord Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
(592) '20 Rev. Edwin H. Kellogg, Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.
(660) '22 Prof. Fred T. Kelly, 2019 Monroe St., Madison, Wis.
(725) '22 Prof. Alexander P. Kelso, B. Sc., Southwestern Presb. Univ., Memphis, Tenn.
(338) '00 Pres. James A. Kelso, Ph. D., 725 Ridge Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa.
(438) '08 Prof. Eliza H. Kendrick, Ph. D., Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
(649) '21 Rev. Paca Kennedy, D. D., Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va.
(892) '27 Rev. Robert O. Kevin, 4221 Osage Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
(895) '27 Carl H. King, 101 Columbia Ave., Lynchburg, Va. ~~U.S.A.~~
(852) '26 Prof. Edward H. Knight, D. D., 71 Tremont St., Hartford, Conn.
(544) '15 Prof. Carl S. Knopf, 2102 Yale Sta., New Haven, Conn.
(460) '10 Rev. Raymond C. Knox, Columbia Univ., N. Y. City.
(909) '28 George Alexander Kohut, 1 W. 70th St., New York City.
(767) '24 Prof. Carl H. Kraeling, Yale Sta., New Haven Conn.
(518) '14 Rev. Emil G. H. Kraeling, 531 E. 18th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
(952) '29 Prof. Howard T. Kuist, Ph. D., 235 East 49th St., N. Y. City.
(879) '27 Rev. Robert M. Kurtz, M. A., 8 E. Westervelt Ave., Tenafly, N.J.
(473) '11 Rev. M. G. Kyle, D. D., Xenia Theol. Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.
(519) '14 Prof. Elbert C. Lane, Hartford Theol. Sem., Hartford, Conn.
(880) '27 Prof. Frank G. Lankard, Drew University, Madison New Jersey.
(910) '28 Paul F. Laubenstein, S. T. M., 255 Montauk Ave., New London, Conn.
(755) '23 Rev. P. A. Laury, D. D., 243 E., Garrison St., Bethlehem, Pa.
(743) '23 Prof. Darwin Ashley Leavitt, B. D., 641 Church St., Beloit, Wis.
(665) '21 Prof. Elmer A. Leslie, 228 Mason Terrace, Brookline, Mass.

(769) '24 Rabbi Leon Liebreich, M. A., 640 W. State St., Trenton, N. J.
(953) '29 Rev. S. A. Livingstone, M. A., 190 Summit Ave., Providence, R. I.
(622) '21 Miss Grace Lockton, 107 W. 3rd St., Frederick, Md.
(372) '04 Prof. Lindsay B. Longacre, 2273 S. Fillmore St., Denver, Colo.
(674) '22 Mrs. Mary B. Longyear, 60 Leicester Ter., Brookline, Mass.
(845) '26 Rev. Arnold E. Look, Ph. D., Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield, Mass.
(944) '29 Rev. John Lowe, Trinity College, Toronto 5, Canada.
(715) '22 Prof. William J. Lowstuter, 72 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
(720) '22 Prof. Nils W. Lund, Th.M., North Park College, Chicago, Illinois.
(590) '18 Mrs. Eugene W. Lyman, Union Theol. Sem., Broadway at 120th, N. Y. City.
(71) '82 Prof. D. G. Lyon, 12 Scott St., Cambridge, Mass.
(324) '26 Prof. W. Vernon Lytle, Ph. D., De Pauw Univ., Greencastle, Ind.
(847) '26 Prof. S. V. McCasland, Ph. D., Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.
(721) '22 Prof. W. H. McClellan, S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.
(954) '29 Dean John Dale McCormick, A. M., D. D., Kimball School, Salem, Oregon.
(536) '15 Prof. C. C. McCown, Ph. D., D. D., American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, Palestine.
(881) '27 Rev. Walter T. McCree, M. A., Streetsville, Ontario, Canada.
(319) '98 Prof. John E. McFadyen, United Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland.
(300) '96 Pres. Arthur C. McGiffert, D. D., Union Theol. Sem., N.Y. City.
(424) '08 Prof. J. Gresham Machen, Chancellor Hall Apartments, 13th St. below Walnut, Philadelphia, Pa.
(637) '21 Rev. Edward Mack, D. D., 4 Westwood Avenue, Richmond, Va.
(804) '25 Rev. John V. Madison, B. D., M. A., 615 Ave. C, Fort Dodge, Iowa.
(742) '23 Prof. J. R. Mantey, Th. D., 3034 W. Wash. Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
(837) '26 Ralph Marcus, Ph. D., 160 Claremont N. Y. City.
(681) '22 Rabbi Elias Margolis, Ph. D., 16 Glen Ave., Mt. Vernon, N. Y.
(516) '13 Prof. Max L. Margolis, Ph. D., Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
(853) '26 John Martin, Esq., North Adams, Mass.
(545) '15 Prof. Alexander Marx, Ph. D., 531 W. 123d St., N. Y. City.
(911) '28 Rev. Thomas B. Mather, Th. D., 419 E. Capital, Jefferson City, Mo.
(860) '26 Prof. Takuo Matsumoto, Aoyama Gakuin Theol. Seminary, Tokyo, Japan.
(770) '24 Charles D. Matthews, Birmingham Southern College, Birmingham, Ala.

(617) '21 Prof. I. G. Matthews, Crozer Theol. Sem., Chester, Pa.
(846) '26 Prof. Joseph B. Matthews, S. T. M., Howard University, Washington, D. C.
(546) '15 Rev. John A. Maynard, Ph. D., D. D., 7149 Juno St., Forest Hills, L. I., N. Y.
(584) '18 Prof. Théophile J. Meek, Univ. of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada.
(882) '27 John H. Meengs, Th. D., 3258 Riverview, No. Park, Grand Rapids, Mich.
(771) '24 Rev. Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph. D., D. D., Grafton, Mass.
(601) '20 Rev. Henry H. Meyer, D. D., Ph. D., 20 Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
(945) '29 Prof. Fred E. Miles, B. D., M. A., Ozark Wesleyan College, Carthage, Mo.
(961) '29 Allen J. Miller, B. A., 2197 Yale Sta., New Haven, Conn.
(639) '22 Prof. Russell B. Miller, Ph. D., Ohio Wesleyan Univ., Delaware, Ohio.
(585) '15 Mrs. Ruth Richards Miller, Ph. D., 50 Chetwynd Road, West Sommerville, Mass.
(670) '22 Rabbi Louis A. Mischkind, P. O. Box 154, Wilmington, Del.
(475) '11 Prof. Conrad H. Moehlmann, 51 Mulberry St., Rochester, N. Y.
(921) '28 Prof. James Moffatt, D. D., Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., New York City.
(838) '26 Rev. G. Gardner Monks, B. D., Lenox School, Lenox, Mass.
(236) '92 Prof. J. A. Montgomery, Äh. D., 6806 Greene St., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.
(912) '28 Lewis C. Moon, 3107 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.
(566) '16 Pres. Julian Morgenstern, Ph. D., 3988 Parker Place, Cincinnati, Ohio.
(698) '22 Prof. Elmer W. K. Mould, 503 Fitch St., Elmira, N. Y.
(331) '99 Pres. Warren J. Moulton, Ph.D., Bangor Theol. Sem., Bangor, Me.
(772) '24 Prof. James Muilenberg, Mt. Holyoke College, S. Hadley, Mass.
(868) '27 W. H. Murray, 60 Fifth Ave., New York City.
(627) '21 Prof. Thomas Kinloch Nelson, M. A., D. D., Theol. Sem., Alexandria, Va.
(508) '13 Rev. Wm. M. Nesbit, Ph. D., Watertown, Conn.
(924) '28 Mrs. Robert W. New, Giselastr. 28/II, Munich, Germany.
(806) '25 Prof. Herbert L. Newman, B. D., 2 West Court, Waterwille, Maine.
(608) '20 Rabbi Louis I. Newman, 125 Jordan Ave., San Francisco, Cal.
(966) '28 Miss Helen R. H. Nichol, M. A., 110 Columbia Ave., Westmount, Quebec, Canada.
(839) '26 Prof. Edward E. Nourse, D. D., Hartford Theol. Seminary, Hartford, Conn.

(820) '24 Prof. Julian Obermann, 9 W. 97th St., N. Y. City.
(732) '22 Rev. Henry Offerman, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.
(476) '11 Miss Ellen S. Ogden, Ph. D., Resthaven, R. F. D., Milford, Mass.
(859) '26 Miss M. Evelyn Oliver, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
(572) '16 Prof. Albert T. Olmstead, Ph. D., Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(857) '26 E. A. Overton, A. M., 1815 Morningside Ave., Sioux City, Iowa.
(773) '24 Prof. Ernest W. Parsons, 278 Alexander St., Rochester, N. Y.
(757) '23 Mrs. Katherine S. H. Paton, S. T. B., 50 Forest St., Hartford, Conn.
(240) '92 Prof. L. B. Paton, Ph. D., 50 Forest St., Hartford Conn.,
(323) '98 Prof. Ismar J. Peritz, Ph. D., Syracuse, N. Y.
(623) '21 Prof. Alfred Morris Perry, Ph. D., Bangor Theol. Seminary, Bangor, Maine.
(611) '21 Prof. Robert H. Pfeiffer, S. T. M., Ph. D., 82 Larch Road, Cambridge, Mass.
(748) '23 Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., 2224 R. St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
(774) '24 Rev. M. Wayne Pickerel, S. T. B., Pilger, Nebr.
(958) '29 Prof. Frank K. Pool, Furman Univ., Greenville, S. C.
(378) '05 Prof. William Popper, Ph. D., Univ. of California, Berkeley, Cal.
(254) '93 Prof. F. C. Porter, D. D., 1111 Yale Sta., New Haven, Conn.
(532) '15 Prof. Thomas Porter, Ph. D., S. T. D., Rua Padre Vieira 3, Campinas, Brazil.
(822) '25 Prof. H. H. Powell, 1051 Taylor St., San Francisco, Calif.
(509) '13 Prof. Waldo S. Pratt, 86 Gillett St., Hartford, Conn.
(556) '16 Rev. Sartell Prentice, D. D., 17 E. 11th. St., New York City.
(176) '87 Prof. Ira M. Price, Ph. D., Univ. of Chicago, Ill.
(597) '20 Prof. Alex. C. Purdy, Ph. D., Hartford Theol. Sem., Hartford, Conn.
(775) '24 C. E. Purinton, Apt. A-4, 266 Washington Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
(701) '22 Prof. Herbert R. Purinton, Bates College, Lewiston, Maine.
(653) '21 Prof. Charles Lynn Pyatt, College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky.
(883) '27 Prof. Chester Warren Quimby, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.
(913) '28 Prof. Harry Ranston, care of Mrs. A. S. Emmott, Mount St., West-Lane, Kreighley, Yorkshire, England.
(557) '16 Pres. John H. Raven, D. D., Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.
(361) '03 Pres. Herry L. Reed, Auburn Theol. Sem., Auburn, N. Y.
(914) '28 Max I. Reich, 624 Crown St., Morrisville, Pa.

(848) '26 Prof. Nathaniel Reich, P. O. Box 337, Philadelphia, Pa.
(533) '15 Joseph Reider, Ph. D., Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.
(861) '26 Rev. Percy F. Rex, B. D., Tarriffville, Conn.
(893) '27 Miss Anna Virena Rice, 600 Lexington Ave., New York City.
(776) '24 Rev. Hilary G. Richardson, A. B., B. D., Yonkers, N. Y.
(777) '24 Donald W. Riddle, Faculty Exchange, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(510) '13 Prof. Frank H. Ridgley, Ph. D., Lincoln Univ., Chester Co., Penna.
(815) '25 Corwin C. Roach, American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, Palestine.
(455) '10 Prof. A. T. Robertson, D. D., Southern Bap. Theol. Sem., Louisville, Ky.
(884) '27 J. B. Robertson, B. D., La Grange, Ky.
(389) '06 Prof. Benj. W. Robinson, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.
(826) '26 Miss Dorothy B. Robinson, B. D., Mt. Holyoke College, S. Hadley, Mass.
(284) '95 Prof. Geo. L. Robinson, Ph.D., 2312 N. Halsted St., Chicago, Ill.
(285) '95 Prof. James H. Ropes, D. D., 13 Follen St., Cambridge, Mass.
(687) '22 Rabbi William Rosenau, 1515 Eutaw Place, Baltimore, Md.
(897) '27 H. H. Rowley, B. D., Rydal Mount, Pellhurst Road, Ryder, I. o. W., England.
(387) '05 Dean Elbert Russell, Ph. D., Duke University, Durham, N. C.
(779) '24 Rabbi Norman Salit, J. D., 1152 New St., Far Rockaway, L. I., N. Y.
(456) '10 Prof. J. R. Sampey, LL. D., Southern Bap. Theol. Sem., Louisville, Ky.
(187) '88 Rev. F. K. Sanders, Ph. D., Rockport, Mass.
(511) '13 Prof. H. A. Sanders, Ph. D., Porta S. Pancrazio, Roma, Italy.
(780) '24 Rev. J. Foster Savidge, S. T. M., Church of the Holy Communion, Norwood, N. J.
(190) '88 Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, Ph. D., Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N. Y.
(708) '22 Prof. W. F. Schneider, D. D., 1504 Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa.
(669) '22 Mr. Wilfred H. Schoff, Commercial Museum, Philadelphia, Pa.
(457) '10 Rev. Samuel Schulman, D. D., 27 West 72nd St., N. Y. City.
(955) '29 Prof. Paul J. Schwab, 211 Martha St., Waxahachie, Texas.
(463) '10 Prof. E. F. Scott, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., N. Y. City.
(956) '29 Prof. Stanley Scott, Ph. D., 618 Worth St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
(856) '26 Prof. William Scott, Randolph-Macon College, Lynchburg, Va.
(807) '25 Keith C. Seele, 648 Milwaukee Ave., Elkhart, Ind.

(520) '14 Prof. Wm. G. Seiple, 125 Tsuchidoi, Sendai, Miyagi Ken, Japan.
(699) '22 Prof. Arthur G. Sellen, Ph. D., Washburn College, Topeka, Kans.
(676) '22 Prof. Ovid R. Sellers, Ph. D., 846 Chalmers Place, Chicago, Ill.
(408) '07 Prof. Charles N. Shepard, Gen. Theol. Sem., Chelsea Sq., N. Y. City.
(885) '57 Henry A. Sherman, 597 Fifth Ave., New York City.
(808) '25 A. R. Siebens, 2330 N. Halsted St., Chicagn, Ill.
(683) '22 Mr. Benjamin Silkiner. 101 W. 113th St., New York City.
(337) '00 Prof. Charles F. Sitterly, D. D., Drew Theol. Sem., Madison, N.J.
(849) '26 Dr. S. L. Skoss, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
(946) '29 Rev. David K. Sloatman, B. A., B. D., Rowayton, Conn.
(841) '26 Prof. W. Aiken Smart, D. D., Emory University, Ga.
(947) '29 Rev. Hay Watson Smith, D. D., 819 W. Fourth St., Little Rock, Ark.
(786) '24 Rev. H. Framer Smith, M. A., B. D., 167 W. Chelten Ave., Germantown, Pa.
(409) '07 Prof. John M. P. Smith, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(548) '15 Miss Louise P. Smith, Wellesley College, Wellesley 81, Mass.
(603) '20 Prof. Robert Seneca Smith, 1157 Yale Sta., New Haven, Conn.
(580) '17 Rev. J. Edward Snyder, Box 502, Grand Forks, N. D.
(787) '24 Ephraim A. Speiser, Ph. D., University of Penns., Philadelphia, Pa.
(863) '26 Prof. R. T. Stamm, 123 Springs Ave., Gettysburg, Pa.
(328) '99 Prof. Wallace N. Stearns, Ph. D., Jacksonville, Ill.
(738) '23 Rev. Ferris J. Stephens, Ph. D., Yale Babylonian Collection, New Haven, Conn.
(567) '16 Prof. Paul R. Stevick, Ozark Wesleyan College, Carthage, Mo.
(716) '22 Prof. Harris B. Stewart, 15 Seminary St., Auburn, N. Y.
(915) '28 William B. Stimson, 1920 Panama St., Philadelphia, Pa.
(886) '27 Edward C. Stone, 40 Allen Place, Hartford, Conn.
(916) '28 Miss Pearle F. Stone, Ashley, Ohio.
(922) '28 Rev. John W. Suter, Jr., B. D., 281 Fourth Ave., New York City.
(917) '28 Rev. Ronald J. Tamblyn, B. D., 211 Hendrix St., Greensboro, N. C.
(918) '28 George S. Tarry, B. S., Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.
(894) '27 Rev. Charles L. Taylor, Jr., Th. M., 99 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass.
(810) '25 Prof. W. R. Taylor, Ph. D., University College, Toronto, Ont., Canada.
(919) '28 Prof. Chaim Tchernowitz, Ph. D., 435 Convent Ave., New York City.

(851) '26 Rabbi Sidney S. Tedesche, Ph. D., 200 Linden St., New. Haven, Conn.
(691) '22 Rev. Patrick J. Temple, S. T. D., 104 Mount Joy Place, New Rochelle, N. Y.
(111) '84 Rev. Roderick Terry, D. D., Newport, R. I.
(342) '00 Rev. Charles S. Thayer, Ph. D., 4 Gillette St., Hartford, Conn.
(813) '25 Prof. David E. Thomas, Ph. D., 804 Virginia Ave., Columbia, Mo.
(859) '29 Rev. M. H. Throop, St. John's Univ., Shanghai. China.
(695) '22 Rev. Edward K. Thurlow, S. T. M., Sheffield, Mass.
(257) '93 Prof. C. C. Torrey, D. D., 191 Bishop St., New Haven, Conn.
(781) '24 P. Raffaele Tramontano, College S. Luigi, Posilipo, Naples, Italy.
(480) '11 Prof. Harold H. Tryon, Union Theol Sem., N. Y. City.
(920) '28 Rev. Morris H. Turk, Ph. D., D. D., 17 West St., Portland, Maine.
(948) '29 Rev. Dudley Tyng, Barrington, R. I.
(492) '12 Prof. J. Milton Vance, 930 N. Bever St., Wooster, O.
(706) '22 Rev. Selby Frame Vance, D. D., LL. D., 237 Hilands Ave., Ben Avon, Pittsburgh, Pa.
(549) '15 Rev. Prof. A. A. Vaschalde. Ph. D., Catholic. Univ., Washington, D. C.
(663) '22 Prof. E. E. Voigt, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
(713) '22 Rev. R. B. Wallace, D. D., 833 E. Rittenhouse St., Philadelphia, Pa.
(957) '29 Donald C. Ward, B. A., B. D., 301 Orchard St., New Haven, Conn
(791) '24 Prof. O. W. Warmingham, 72 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
(521) '14 Prof. LeRoy Waterman, 1835 Vinewood Bvd., Ann Arbor, Mich.
(949) '29 Prof. Paul C. Warren, 207 W. 107 th. St., N. Y., City.
(812) '25 Prof. Orville E. Watson, D. D., Bexley Hall, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.
(657) '21 Prof. W. G. Watson, B. D., 40 Francklyn St., Halifax, N. S., Canada.
(643) '21 Dean Thomas Wearing, Ph. D., 192 Oxford St., Rochester, N. Y.
(658) '21 Rev. J. H. Webster, D. D., 5738 Clemens Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
(667) '22 Prof. Gordon B. Wellman, Th. D., 17 Midland Road, Wellesley 81 Mass.
(689) '22 Pres. W. W. White, Ph. D., D. D., 541 Lexington Ave., New York City.
(445) '09 Prof. Edward A. Wicher, D. D., San Francisco Theol. Sem., San Anselmo, Cal.
(726) '22 Rev. Dean Rockwell Wickes, American Board Mission, Lintsing, Sung., China.
(535) '15 Prof. Laura H. Wild, Mt. Holyoke College, S. Hadley, Mass.
(684) '22 Prof. Clyde E. Wildman, 238 Kensington Place, Syracuse, N. Y.

(696) '22 Chas. B. Williams, Ph. D., D. D., Union Univ., Jackson, Tenn.
(900) '27 Prof. Edward O. Williams, B. Th., A. M., 340 W. 55th St., N. Y. City.
(275) '95 Rev. Leighton Williams, Marlborough, N. Y.
(790) '24 H. R. Willoughby, 139 Goodspeed Hall, Univ. of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
(609) '20 Miss Olive May Winchester, 604 Fourteenth Ave. S., Nampa, Idaho.
(788) '24 Pres. S. S. Wise, Ph. D., LL. D., Jewish Institute of Religion, W. 68th St., N. Y. City.
(672) '22 Rev. J. E. Wishart, D. D., San Francisco Theol. Sem., San Anselmo, Calif.
(782) '24 Prof. H. A. Wolfson, 85 Prescott St., Cambridge, Mass.
(630) '21 Rev. Clinton T. Wood, M. A., 912 North Bever St., Wooster, Ohio.
(272) '94 Prof. Irving F. Wood, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
(497) '12 Prof. W. C. Wood, Ph. D., College of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif.
(644) '21 Prof. William H. Wood, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
(842) '26 Rev. Prof. Edw. Strong Worcester, D. D., Theol. Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.
(697) '22 Pres. William L. Worcester, 5 Bryant St., Cambridge, Mass.
(625) '21 Prof. M. J. Wyngaarden, Ph. D., c/o Calvin College Library, Grand Rapids, Mich.
(412) '07 Rev. Royden K. Yerkes, Ph. D., D. D., 3723 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
(538) '15 Prof. Harry C. York, Ph. D., 602 W. Washington Ave, Elmira, N. Y.
(717) '22 Elmer H. Zaugg, Ph. D., Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio.
(428) '08 Prof. Blanche Zehring, 309 E. Linden Ave, Miamisburg, O.
(610) '20 Prof. Solomon Zeitlin, Ph. D., Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTIONS

WHICH SUBSCRIBE FOR THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE SOCIETY

American Library in Paris,	10 Rue de L'Elysée (8). Paris, France.
American School of Oriental Research,	Jerusalem, Palestine.
Amherst College Library	Amherst, Mass.
Auburn Theological Seminary	Auburn, N. Y.

Bangor Theological Seminary,	Bangor, Me.
Beloit College Library,	Beloit, Wisconsin.
Berkeley Baptist Divinity School,	Berkeley, Calif.
Bowdoin College Library,	Brunswick, Me.
British Museum Library,	London, England.
Brown University Library,	Providence, R. I.
Bryn Mawr College,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Bucknell Library,	Chester, Pa.
Carnegie Free Library of Allegheny, Federal and Ohio Sts. N. S.,	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Carnegie Library,	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Cleveland Public Library,	Cleveland, Ohio.
Columbia University Library,	N. Y. City.
Congregational Library,	Boston, Mass.
Cornell University Library,	Ithaca, N. Y.
Divinity Hall, 740 University St.,	Montreal, Canada.
Divinity School Library, 24nd & Locust Streets	Philadelphia, Pa.
Drew Theological Seminary Library,	Madison, N. J.
Duke University Library,	Durham, N. C.
Enoch Pratt Free Library,	Baltimore, Md.
Free Library,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Free Public Library,	486 Jersey Ave., Jersey City, N. J.
Gardner A. Sage Library	New Brunswick, N. J.
General Theological Seminary,	N. Y. City.
Gettysburg Theological Seminary,	Gettysburg, Pa.
Harvard College Library,	Cambridge, Mass.
Haverford College Library,	Haverford, Pa.
Hebrew Union College Library,	Cincinnati, Ohio.
Hebrew University Library,	Jerusalem, Palestine.
James Milliken University,	Decatur, Ill.
Jewish Institute of Religion,	West 68th St., N. Y. City.
John Rylands Library.	Manchester, England.
Johns Hopkins University Library,	Baltimore, Md.
Library, International Y. M. C. A. College,	Springfield, Mass.
Library of Congress,	Washington, D. C.
Libreria de Augustin Bosch, 5 Ronda de la Universidad,	Barcelona, Spain.
Main Library, 8th and Grande Ave.,	Milwaukee, Wis.
Margaret Carnegie Library,	Mills College, Calif.
Mount Holyoke College Library,	South Hadley, Mass.

Newberry Library,	Chicago, Ill.
Newton Theol. Institution Library,	Newton Centre 39, Mass.
Northern Baptist Seminary Library,	3040 W. Washington Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
Northwestern University Library,	Evanston, Ill.
Oberlin College Library,	Oberlin, Ohio.
Ohio State University Library,	Columbus, Ohio.
Pacific School of Religion,	Berkeley, Cal.
Pacific Unitarian School, Dana and Allston Way,	Berkeley, Calif.
Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 616 W. North Ave.,	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Public Library,	Boston, Mass.
Public Library, 197 Montague St.,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Public Library,	Chicago, Ill.
Public Library,	Grand Rapids, Mich.
Public Library,	New York, N. Y.
Public Library,	St. Louis, Mo.
Public Library of Victoria,	Melbourne, Australia.
Queen's University,	Kingston, Ontario, Can.
Rochester Theological Seminary Library,	Rochester, N. Y.
San Francisco Seminary Library,	San Anselmo, Calif.
Scarritt College Library,	Nashville, Tenn.
Shantung Christian Univ.	Tsinan, Shantung, China.
State Library,	Albany, N. Y.
State Library,	Concord, N. H.
State Library,	Lansing, Mich.
State Library,	Sacramento, Cal.
Syracuse University Library,	Syracuse, N. Y.
Trowbridge Reference Library,	Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Union Theological Seminary Library,	N. Y. City.
University Library,	Cambridge, England.
University of California,	Berkeley, Calif.
University of Illinois,	Urbana, Ill.
University of Michigan Library,	Ann Arbor, Mich.
University of Pennsylvania Library,	Philadelphia, Pa.
University of Wisconsin Library,	Madison, Wis.
Vassar College Library,	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Wellesley College Library,	Wellesley, Mass.
Wesleyan University Library,	Middletown, Conn.
Western State Normal School,	Kalamazoo, Mich.

Western Theological Seminary, Ridge Ave.,	Pittsburgh, Pa.
Yale University Library,	New Haven, Conn.
Zion Research Library,	60 Leicester St., Brookline, Mass.

LIST OF EXCHANGES

(To be sent to Professor George Dahl, 2102 Yale Sta., New Haven, Conn., and ultimately to go to the American School of Archaeology in Jerusalem.)

Anglican Theological Review,	2145 Orrington, Ave., Evanston, Ill.
Archiv für Orientforschung,	Babelsbergerstr. 48, Berlin-Wilmersdorf.
Biblica,	Istituto Biblico Pontifico, Piazza Pilotta 35, Rima I., Italy.
Biblioteca Vaticana,	Vaticano, Rome, Italy.
Canadian Journal of Religious Thought, 73 Queens Park,	Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
Expository Times,	Edinburgh, Scotland.
International Index to Periodicals, 958 University Ave.,	New York City.
Jewish Quarterly Review, Dropsie College Library,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Journal of Religion, Univ. of Chicago,	Chicago, Ill.
Journal of Theological Studies,	London, England.
Journal of Transactions of the Victoria Institute,	London, England.
Kalich,	Hus Theological Faculty, Prague I, Klementinum, Czecho-Slovakia.
Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift,	Haarlem, Holland.
Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Wissenschaft,	Berlin C 2, Schloß, Portal 3.
Princeton Theological Review,	Princeton, N. J.
Review and Expositor (So. Bapt.),	Louisville, Ky.

Revue Biblique Internationale, 90 Rue Bonaparte,	Paris, France.
Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Réligieuses	Care Prof. Ménégoz, Palais de l'Université, Strasbourg, France.
Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,	Göttingen, Nikolausbergerweg 53, Germany.
Zeitschrift für dir neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,	Berlin-Wilmersdorf, Berliner Straße 65.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS

OF THE

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

(As Amended Dec. 28, 1901 and Dec. 28, 1923)

CONSTITUTION

I

This association shall be called "The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis."

II

The object of the Society shall be to stimulate the critical study of the Scriptures by presenting, discussing, and publishing original papers on Biblical topics.

III

The officers of the Society shall be a President, a Vice-President, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, and a Treasurer, who, with five others, shall be united in a Council. These shall be elected annually by the Society, with the exception of the Corresponding Secretary, who shall be elected annually by the Council. Additional members of the Council shall be the Presidents of the Sections hereinafter provided for. There shall be also a Publishing Committee, consisting of the Corresponding Secretary and two others, who shall be annually chosen by the Council.

IV

Members shall be elected by the Society upon the recommendation of the Council. They may be of two classes, active and honorary. Honorary members shall belong to other nationalities than that of the United States of America, and shall be especially distinguished for their attainments as Biblical scholars. The number of honorary members chosen at the first election shall be not more than ten; in any succeeding year not more than two.

V

The Society shall meet at least once a year, at such time and place as the Council may determine. On the first day of the annual meeting the President, or some other member appointed by the Council for the purpose, shall deliver an address to the Society.

VI

Sections, consisting of all the members of the Society residing in a particular locality, may be organized, with the consent of the Council

for the object stated in Article II, provided that the number of members composing any Section shall not be less than twelve. Each Section shall annually choose for itself a President, whose duty it shall be to preside over its meeting, and to take care that such papers and notes read before it as the Section may judge to be of sufficient value are transmitted promptly to the Corresponding Secretary of the Society. The Sections shall meet as often as they shall severally determine, provided that their meetings do not interfere with the meetings of the Society.

VII

This constitution may be amended by a vote of the Society, on recommendation of the Council, such amendment having been proposed at a previous meeting, and notice of the same having been sent to the members of the Society.

BY-LAWS

I

It shall be the duty of the President, or, in his absence, of the Vice-President, to preside at all the meetings of the Society; but, in the absence of both these officers, the Society may choose a presiding officer from the members present.

II

It shall be the duty of the Recording Secretary to notify the members, at least two weeks in advance, of each meeting, transmitting to them at the same time the list of papers to be presented at the meeting; to keep a record of the proceedings of such meetings; to preserve an accurate roll of the members; to make an annual report of the condition of the Society; to distribute its publications, and to do such other like things as the Council may request.

III

It shall be the duty of the Corresponding Secretary to conduct the correspondence of the Society, and in particular, to use his best efforts for the securing of suitable papers and notes to be presented to the Society at each meeting; to prepare a list of such papers, and to place it in the hands of the Recording Secretary for transmission to the members; to receive all papers and notes that shall have been presented, and lay them before the Publishing Committee.

IV

It shall be the duty of the Treasurer to take charge of all the funds of the Society, and to invest or disburse them under the direction of the Council, rendering an account of all his transactions to the Society at each annual meeting.

V

It shall be the duty of the Council to propose candidates for membership in the Society; to elect the Corresponding Secretary and the additional members of the Publishing Committee; to fix the times and places for meetings, and generally to supervise the interests of the Society.

VI

It shall be the duty of the Publishing Committee to publish the proceedings of the Society, and also to select, edit, and publish, as far as the funds of the Society will justify, such papers and notes from among those laid before them, as shall in their judgment be fitted to promote Biblical science.

VII

Each member shall annually pay a tax of three dollars. The donation at one time, by a single person, of fifty dollars shall exempt the donor from all further payments, and no payments shlal be required of honorary members.

VIII

Each member shall be entitled to receive, without additional charge, one copy of each publication of the Society after his election; in addition to which, if he be a contributor to the JOURNAL, he shall receive twenty-five copies of any article or articles he may have contributed.

IX

Five members of the Council, of whom not less than three shall have been elected directly by the Society, shall constitute a quorum thereof. Twelve members of the Society shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of business, but a smaller number may continue in session for the purpose of hearing and discussing papers presented.

The following resolution, supplementary to the By-Laws, with reference to the price at which members may procure extra copies of the JOURNAL, was adopted June 13th, 1884.

Resolved: That the Secretary be authorized to furnish to members, *for the purpose of presentation*, additional copies of any volume of the JOURNAL, to the number of ten, at the rate of $ 1 a copy, but that the price to persons not members be the amount of the annual assessment.

United Theological Seminary Library

FOR REFERENCE

Do Not Take From This Room

DEMCO